

ESTATE DUTIES.

A MODERN METHOD
of providing them; guaran-
teeing the funds being available
immediately when required;
preserving the Capital of the
Estate intact; and enabling a
valuable rebate of Income
Tax to be claimed.

Full particulars will be found
in a new leaflet recently issued
by and obtainable free from the

LEGAL & GENERAL ASSURANCE SOCIETY LTD.

10, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

(Near Temple Bar)

ASSETS EXCEED £13,800,000.

TELEPHONES: CITY 2633-4.

ESTABLISHED
1836.



The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, OCTOBER 8, 1921.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

£2 12s.; by Post, £2 14s.; Foreign, £2 16s.

HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

*. *The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

CURRENT TOPICS	843	THE WESTMINSTER CITY COUNCIL AND BUILDING	857
THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS	845	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	857
THE LATE MR. HALFOUR BROWNE, K.C.	846	OBITUARY	857
LAWYERS AND THE PROFESSIONAL SPIRIT	847	LEGAL NEWS	857
REVIEW	848	COURT PAPERS	858
BOOKS OF THE WEEK	848	WINDING-UP NOTICES	864
NEW ORDERS, &c.	849	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	864
SOCIETIES	849	PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES	

Current Topics.

The Business of the King's Bench Division.

IT WOULD appear that the King's Bench Division has got to work none too soon. The outstanding feature in the Michaelmas Cause Lists is the large number of cases awaiting hearing in that Division—289 Divisional Court cases and 1,603 actions for trial, a total of 1,892. A year ago the total was 1,125. If we go back before the war to Michaelmas, 1913, we find the total to be 841, and that was swollen by 316 Divisional Court cases; the actions for trial were only 510, with 15 bankruptcy matters. A year or two before, much smaller numbers than those of the present sittings had led to the appointment of the Royal Commission on Delay in the King's Bench Division, which reported in 1913. It remains to be seen whether the judges available will be able to reduce the lists to manageable dimensions.

The Michaelmas Cause Lists.

THE NUMBER of cases in the Chancery Division is somewhat less than a year ago—352 as compared with 372, but there is a long list of company matters—143 as compared with 64, and the bankruptcy matters (18) now appear among the Chancery business in accordance with the transfer which we noticed last week. In the Probate and Divorce lists there is a considerable drop. The officials responsible for the preparation of the lists still make no distinction between probate and divorce work, but, treating the probate work as negligible in comparison, the divorce causes are 1,014; last Michaelmas they were 2,628, so that the pressure in this class of business has for the time abated. The Appeal list (211) is slightly less than a year ago (246). Altogether the Courts will commence the new legal year with plenty of work on hand, but the great question will be how to dispose of the King's Bench Division list. For the special work of this week, 16 judges are sitting, including four from the Chancery Division; but after next Wednesday these latter judges should be left to their own work, unless it is clear that they can be spared without delay to suitors in their own Division.

The Scarborough Meeting.

THE PROVINCIAL Meeting of The Law Society at Scarborough was well attended, and was very successful, both as regards the importance and interest of the papers read and the discussions on them, and as regards the attendant festivities, though these were so arranged as not to offer undue counter attractions—as is sometimes the case—to the business portion of the meetings. We make some comment elsewhere on the President's address and Mr. NESBITT's paper on Solicitors' Remuneration, though any full discussion of the latter subject must be postponed till the committee now considering it has reported. The Lord

Chancellor had been invited to the banquet held on Tuesday evening, but was unable to attend, and was represented by Sir CLAUD SCHUSTER. Sir CLAUD was, perhaps, able to suggest with more grace than Lord BIRKENHEAD that, as regards the establishment of a Ministry of Justice, nothing is to be gained by interfering with the Lord Chancellor. In this view, no doubt, he was encouraged by the President's address, on which we comment elsewhere. But we hope nothing that fell either from Sir CLAUD SCHUSTER or the President will tend to discourage the efforts of the Society to press forward reforms on its own account. We have not failed to recognize the efforts of Lord BIRKENHEAD himself, but reform does not depend on any personal considerations, and the collapse of the attempt made in the Administration of Justice Act, 1920, to establish provincial jurisdiction in divorce cases, and the failure of the Law of Property Bill—two of the reforms on which Lord BIRKENHEAD has laid great stress—show that even a specially energetic Lord Chancellor may find his environment too difficult. We gather that Sir CLAUD SCHUSTER still has hope for the Law of Property Bill, but, as we say elsewhere, the whole form of that Bill should now be reconsidered.

Attachment as a Mode of Civil Execution.

ENGLAND is a country in which old-fashioned and anomalous rules of law are rather apt to linger long after their utility has begun to be doubted not merely by law reformers but by practitioners as well. Inertia preserves an antiquated system until some "hard case" arises, and then the Legislature intervenes to "change all that." The case of the Poplar Councillors appears an excellent illustration of this. Their attachment for contempt, i.e., disobedience to an order of court directing them to levy a rate on Poplar, is technically a mode of civil execution, as distinct from the punishment of a criminal offence. It is, therefore, indefinite in duration and cannot be remitted by the Crown acting on the advice of the Home Secretary. "Criminal contempt," of course, is in a different position. Where such a contempt consists of an interference with the course of justice, it is indictable and punishable like any other crime; in such a case the Crown can pardon, as it can in every criminal case except that of an impeachment. Where, again, a judge convicts for some contempt committed *in facie curie*, the commitment is the punishment of a crime; indeed, a fine is often inflicted in addition to the imprisonment, which may be either of fixed duration or indefinite. In either case, it seems clear, the Crown can remit the punishment, although this is not done in practice. When the punishment is indefinite, it is usual for the judge to release the accused on an application by him accompanied by an apology for the offence. But such "criminal contempts" are quite different from the contempt of court which consists, either in doing some act forbidden by the court, or refusing to do some act ordered by the court; there commitment or "attachment" is a civil, not a criminal, remedy; and no interference by the Home Secretary is possible.

Imprisonment otherwise than for Crime.

BUT A LARGER question is raised by these considerations as to the desirability of attachment as a mode of civil execution. Imprisonment is still permitted by English law under the Judgment Debtors Act of 1869 in a number of cases where the *injuria* is purely civil. The failure to pay a sum ordered by a court having equitable jurisdiction, or to perform an act directed by such a court, is perhaps the most defensible of these; without this drastic remedy, courts of equity would be hampered in their efforts to promote equity and render justice. Imprisonment for civil debt on proof of means is also defensible; for in such a case, provided proper proof is required as is by no means always the case in county court cases, there seems no reason why the creditor should suffer because a debtor who can pay will not do so. But in cases of alimony, in separation orders made by a summary jurisdiction court, in bankruptcy cases, and the like, where lack of means is no defence, the preservation of imprisonment is purely vindictive. The mere fact that a man has been

separated or divorced, and is bound to pay alimony, is no reason why he should be imprisoned if through misfortune he has ceased to earn the sum due under the order. It is true that, in such cases, on an application to the court, the order may be varied; but this is a matter of discretion which benches frequently refuse to exercise on purely vindictive grounds; they treat the matter as if it were in substance a criminal, not a civil, wrong. While this attitude is intelligible, it seems doubtful whether the imprisonment of the respondents in such cases serves any useful social purpose. As we observed last week, a well-known Chancery Judge, now retired, spoke of it not long ago as a relic of barbarism.

Solicitors' Remuneration.

THE PENDING inquiry by the Committee of which Mr. Justice RUSSELL is Chairman into the methods of solicitors' remuneration makes the subject one of special interest at the present time, and in addition to the observations on it by the President in his address, the Scarborough Meeting had the benefit of the interesting paper by Mr. R. C. NESBITT, the most important part of which we print elsewhere. Substantially, the history of legislative control over solicitors' charges begins with an Act of 1729, and this, in effect, introduced the system which has lasted to the present time. It required the delivery of an item bill, which was subject to taxation, and no action for the charges could be brought till after a month from the delivery of the bill. Its provisions were, as Mr. NESBITT points out, largely reproduced in the Act of 1843, but that Act facilitated the taxation and recovery of costs, and it was hoped that it would give the taxing authority discretion to take into consideration the importance of the business, and the skill, labour and responsibility which it involved. But in this the profession were disappointed. Remuneration still depended, not on the value of the work done, but on the length of the proceedings, and the number and length of the documents by which it was done. The Solicitors' Act, 1870, was a step in the right direction, and it authorised payment by a lump sum under special agreement, but the necessity of such an agreement has prevented its being much used. As regards conveyancing, a change was rendered necessary by the Conveyancing Act, 1881. This shortened documents, and made their length no longer possible as a test of remuneration. Hence the Remuneration Act of 1881, and the Order under it establishing scale fees, but leaving a good deal of work to the old system of item charges. The scale fees have not been increased to suit present-day requirements, and they still stop dead at the £100,000 limit. Moreover, while the Order of June, 1920, authorises lump sum instead of item charges under Schedule 2, it must be a lump sum which can be justified, if necessary, by reference to item charges, and hence the Order does not indicate any substantial progress. In practice, as Mr. NESBITT points out, solicitors do not confine themselves to the item charges which the law expects, and bills are delivered in a short summarised form with an offer of details if desired. It is this system which Mr. NESBITT wishes to see authorised by legislation, but for the details of his plan and the arguments by which he supports it we must refer to his paper; also for the considerations which should guide the Taxing Master in deciding on the propriety of the sum charged. We may add that much of the preliminary work which has led up to the present position of the subject was due to the Liverpool Law Society: see 62 SOL. J., p. 117.

Statelessness.

BY THE ALIENS Restriction (Amendment) Act, 1919, the Legislature continued, with modifications, the war restrictions on the admission of aliens to this country, and in particular it imposed for three years special disabilities on former enemy aliens. Thus under sec. 10 (1) no former enemy alien shall, for a period of three years after the passing of the Act, be permitted to land in the United Kingdom without the permission of the Home Secretary, to be granted on special grounds. Whether the

policy of the Act was wise in view of the desirability of restoring as speedily as possible friendly relations between the lately belligerent countries, we need not enquire; but considerable interest has been aroused in the decision of the Home Secretary to apply it in the case of Dr. OSCAR LEVY, who, it appears, has been long enough resident in this country to lose his German nationality, but has not become naturalized here. We gather that he was temporarily absent when the Act was passed, and the Home Secretary now requires him to leave this country. We cannot be certain as to the facts of the case. *Primi facie* it is one of great hardship. But it should be noticed that the condition of "statelessness" has been brought into prominence by the war, and that an interesting decision on it was given recently by RUSSELL, J., in *Stoeck v. Public Trustee* (1921, 2 Ch. 67). In the earlier case of *Ex parte Liebmann* (1916, 1 K.B., p. 283), Lord PHILLIMORE intimated that the law did not recognize that a man could have no nationality, but RUSSELL, J., differed from this, and it seems obvious that if a man has lost one nationality and has not acquired another, he must be "stateless." Accordingly he held that the condition of a stateless person is not a condition unrecognized by the municipal law of this country. Whether this decision covers Dr. LEVY's case so as to put him outside the Aliens Restriction Act, we cannot say. It must be presumed from the course which the Home Secretary is taking that it does not. But we doubt whether he is under any obligation to exercise his powers under circumstances of exceptional hardship, especially when it is now generally recognized that the hostility to Germans resident in England, which was so pronounced in certain quarters during the war, was no more than an unfortunate result of war psychology.

An International Court of Appeal.

ONE OF THE numerous matters of general interest discussed at the recent International Law Conference was the difficult task of constructing an International Court of Appeal. Mr. W. R. BISSCHOP read a paper in which he advocated the establishment of such a Court in civil matters. He said that merchants desired—(1) stability in the interpretation of the existing rules and customs; (2) certainty of obtaining justice against a debtor and equity at the hands of a creditor; (3) simplification of formalities of contracts. Endeavours had been made to assimilate the mercantile and maritime laws of the world by enlisting the energies and common feeling of the mercantile community of various countries to adopt a common form or a common law on subjects of common interest. But common laws needed common interpretation by the national courts of law if stability was to be secured for the mercantile community of the rules which they internationally had agreed to observe. Further, having obtained such interpretation by a court of law under an international agreement, the successful litigant needed the exequatur of the Government of the country where the judgment which he had obtained was to be executed.

Interpretation and Enforcement of Agreements.

Mr. BISSCHOP rightly pointed out, in the paper referred to above, that there are two separate tasks before his proposed court, namely, the interpretation of agreements, conventions, and treaties placed before it, and the enforcement of its view thereon. Both objects might be obtained by the establishment of a court of appeal in matters of international agreements, conventions, and legislation on a common basis. The establishment of an international mercantile Court of Appeal, with appellate jurisdiction from national courts in matters which were regulated by international conventions or international agreements, or by national legislation on the basis of internationally arranged rules, would secure a uniform interpretation of what had been agreed, and a stability of jurisdiction which would do away with the perplexity of judicial decisions at present reigning in an unchecked multitude. The appeal would be on points of law only and would have to be instituted within a certain period after the final national decision was obtained. There is, indeed, as Mr. BISSCHOP pointed out, an interesting analogy between the present functions

of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and such an International Court. The work of the Court would be similar to that of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which decides what is the true interpretation of Roman Dutch law in South Africa and in Ceylon, of French law in Canada and Mauritius, of Spanish law in Trinidad, and of Mahomedan law in British India. The establishment of a Court of Appeal of this nature would not be derogatory to national sovereignty. Each nation concerned—that was to say, each such nation as would vouch for the execution of a decision on appeal—would undertake to attach its own exequatur to the decision, and thereby cover with its own sovereignty the decisions of a court not itself possessing powers of enforcement.

The West Indian Court of Appeal.

THE CREATION last year of a West Indian Court of Appeal, meeting in session at Trinidad, is about to be followed, it would seem, by similar experiments in other groups of Crown Colonies. According to a statement, presumably semi-official, in the October number of *United Empire*, the official publication of the Royal Colonial Institute, Mr. CHURCHILL has decided to adopt tentatively a limited scheme of federation in the Crown Colonies. The plan is to group these colonies in systems, each of which will have a High Commissioner, who will exercise locally powers analogous to those of the Governor-General in India, *i.e.*, he will relieve the Colonial Office of administrative work other than general policy. This must inevitably be followed by the creation of local Courts of Appeal in each of these tentative groups. Probably, at no distant date, Federal Legislatures will follow, but that part of the scheme is not yet ready. The West Indies, says the journal we are quoting, is to form one group with Port of Spain in Trinidad as capital. West Africa will be another. Uganda, Tanganyika, Kenya, Zanzibar and Nyassaland will form a third—and Rhodesia will be given an option of either entering this group or the Union of South Africa, or retaining its present independence. Ceylon, Mauritius, and the Seychelles are to form an Indian Ocean group. The Pacific Islands are to form a Pacific Ocean group. Gibraltar, Cyprus and Malta are to form a Mediterranean group, with Valetta (Malta) as capital. If this anticipation be intelligent, it is clear that the Privy Council will lose a good deal of its present appellate work; local Courts of Appeal must inevitably exhaust the purse of many litigants who otherwise would appeal to the Board. It will be interesting to see how far this plan will actually mature, and, in particular, whether the anticipated Courts of Appeal will all come into existence.

The President's Address.

IN the absence of any organization of the Bar, other than for purely self-regarding purposes, the Law Society alone affords at its general meetings the opportunity for the discussion of matters of current interest alike to the public and to the profession, and the President in his address at the Provincial Meeting exercises the recognized function of summarising these matters and laying emphasis on those which require special consideration. The address delivered by Mr. BOTTERELL formed no exception, and if on some points he was unable to give much enlightenment, this was due to the nature of the material with which he had to deal rather than to any defect of treatment. Some matters—such as fees to counsel, the fusion of the two branches, and the length of legal vacations—seem to have drifted into a backwater, and although they emerge spasmodically from time to time, they can hardly be said to be attracting just now any special interest. The question of fees to counsel is hung up, we believe, between the Council of the Law Society and the Bar Council, and though Mr. BOTTERELL criticises severely the rule governing junior counsel's fees, the trouble springs mainly from the fancy fees paid to some leading counsel. The Law Society has, too, recently pronounced against fusion to make that a live issue, and to the

many lawyers who have found the present Long Vacation an exceptionally busy time, the question of the holiday which the courts may see fit to take becomes of comparatively slight importance. Mr. BOTTERELL takes the view that the first fortnight is wanted for clearing up office arrears, and the last fortnight for preparing for the next sittings, and there is no great interval left, especially when the whole *posse* of High Court Judges, common law and equity, swoop down on the last week in order to reduce in anticipation the Michaelmas lists. The matters of immediate interest with which Mr. BOTTERELL dealt were the proposed Ministry of Justice, the Law of Property Bill, Solicitors' Remuneration, and Solicitors' Clerks.

As to the Ministry of Justice, Mr. BOTTERELL recognises the soundness of the objection to the present system, that the Lord Chancellor has an accumulation of duties which it is impossible for one man adequately to perform; but he differs from all recent criticism by advocating the retention of the Lord Chancellor as the Minister of Justice and the transfer of part of his duties to one or other of the existing Departments of State. The general opinion has been in favour of a contrary change—the Lord Chancellor to retain the appointment of judges and other exceptional functions, and his general non-judicial and non-legislative duties to be transferred to a Minister of Justice.

Mr. BOTTERELL, indeed, while he did not overlook Mr. SAMUEL GARRETT'S address (62 SOL. J., 275), nor the recommendation of the Machinery of Government Committee (63 SOL. J., 196), seems to have allowed too little weight to the arguments already advanced in favour of a Ministry of Justice, and he overlooked the fact that the Law Society is already committed to this reform. Mr. GARRETT'S address was delivered to a Special General Meeting of the Society in January, 1918, and after a dilatory amendment had been put and lost, his resolution, "That in the opinion of this General Meeting of the Law Society the institution of a Ministry of Justice is necessary in the national interest," was carried. We doubt whether it was in the mind of any person who supported this resolution that the Lord Chancellor would himself be the Minister of Justice. There was no intention to deprive him of his position as head of the judiciary with the appointment of judges, but the details of legal administration were to be entrusted to another official.

But the impossible position in which the Lord Chancellor is placed had been the subject of discussion a few years earlier before the Royal Commission on the Civil Service. Lord HALDANE in his evidence before that Commission said (question 60,907):—

"I am myself satisfied that you will never solve the great problem that you have until you set up a Minister of Justice who will absorb, in addition to the administrative work of the Lord Chancellor, much of the legal patronage and functions of the Home Secretary and much of those of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. . . . That Minister of Justice will sit probably in the House of Commons and be responsible to it."

The Commission in their Report on the Legal Departments (Sixth Report, p. 21) referred to this evidence, and noted that Lord HALDANE considered the creation of a Ministry of Justice necessary; but they did not consider that the matter fell within the scope of their reference, and made no other recommendation except that all patronage exercised by the judges should be transferred to the Lord Chancellor, and that the control of all the legal departments, including the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Registries, should be placed in his hands. This, it was recognised, would necessitate further assistance being given to the Permanent Secretary, "who has at present practically no staff to assist him in what are already very arduous duties."

Lord HALDANE was able to carry the matter somewhat further in the Machinery of Government Committee of which he was chairman. In a passage which we quoted at the time, this Committee in their Report said:—

"We are impressed with the total inadequacy of the organisation which controls the general administration of the very large staffs, with the voluminous business, required to give effect to the decrees of the Courts of Justice throughout the country. One of the chief reasons of this inadequacy is the magnitude and variety of the duties with which the Lord Chancellor is charged, without really being allowed either the time or the machinery requisite for their performance."

As we have said, Mr. BOTTERELL is not averse from the idea of a Minister of Justice, but he reverses the scheme hitherto suggested by leaving the Lord Chancellor as such Minister, while transferring part of his duties to other Departments, and at the same time increasing his secretarial staff. One reason which he assigns for this is that it will ensure the Minister of Justice being a lawyer. But that is by no means essential to the scheme for a Minister of Justice, and, indeed, in the interesting series of articles on "Reconstruction" from a very able contributor which we published three years ago (63 SOL. J.), the point was made that it would be more in accordance with constitutional practice if the Minister was not a lawyer. The Secretary for War is not a soldier; the First Lord of the Admiralty is not a sailor. In both cases professional qualifications are considered to be more properly utilised in an advisory capacity than at the head of the Department; and while it is quite probable that the Minister of Justice would often be a lawyer, there is no necessity for the choice to be thus restricted. Indeed, our contributor regarded the appointment of a civil or non-professional head of the Judicature as the most logical and direct assertion of the fact that the Judicature is made for the people and not the people for the Judicature. It may be suggested, too, that for lawyers, as for other people, it is well to "see ourselves as others see us." Moreover, to ensure the full efficiency of the Ministry of Justice, the Minister should, as a general rule, be in the House of Commons. While, therefore, we are glad to see that Mr. BOTTERELL is in favour of the proposed Ministry, we cannot say that his variation of the suggested scheme is likely to be useful. In effect, he goes back upon the resolution of the Law Society referred to above, and proposes a less efficient means of creating a Department of Justice.

As to the Law of Property Bill, Mr. BOTTERELL did not add anything to what is already known to the profession. If the Lord Chancellor and the Council of the Law Society had been better advised, the Bill would have been brought forward in a much simpler form and there should have been no difficulty in passing it. Mr. BOTTERELL says that its failure to pass the House of Commons was owing to pressure of time, and that there can be little doubt that the Bill will be brought forward again at the earliest possible opportunity. That remains to be seen. If it had been passed last session, it would then have been possible to set about amending it and dividing it into its component parts, and consolidating these with the cognate statutes—the Conveyancing, Settled Land, Trustee, and Land Transfer Acts—so as to make it a workable measure. And at the same time, Part I—and particularly Clause 3—would have called for thorough revision. But the Bill cannot hang on from year to year in its present form, and we are not so confident as Mr. BOTTERELL that it will be re-introduced.

We cannot do more than refer to Mr. BOTTERELL'S treatment of the subjects of Solicitors' Remuneration and of Solicitors' Clerks and their salaries. It is to be hoped that during his year of office the practice of delivering lump sum bills will be legalised. As to the latter subject, he thinks that the difficulty of applying the principle of collective bargaining to professional businesses should not be insuperable. Here, again, it may be hoped that his year of office will see a satisfactory solution.

The late Mr. Balfour Browne, K.C.

THE death took place on 27th September of Mr. JOHN HUTTON BALFOUR BROWNE, K.C., at his Scottish home, "Goldielea," near Dumfries. The cause of death was a heart attack. Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE, who was 76 years of age, was born on 13th September, 1845, at Crichton House, Dumfries, his father being at the time Medical Superintendent of the Royal Crichton Institution. His mother was a daughter of Dr. ANDREW BALFOUR, Edinburgh, and a sister of Professor J. H. BALFOUR, who held the Chair of Botany in Edinburgh University. Through his mother, Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE was also connected with Dr. HUTTON, who wrote a very important and learned work on geological science, entitled "The Theory of the Earth."

Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE, who for many years before he retired had the largest and most lucrative practice at the Parliamentary Bar, was educated at Dumfriess Academy, of which he was dux, and Edinburgh University, where he likewise had a brilliant career. He shewed there a marked predilection and ability for literature, and he was the medallist in the English Literature Class, when Professor MASSON was at his best. It was in 1868 that Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE turned his steps southwards, like two other famous Scotsmen, Lords FINLAY and HALDANE, and in that year he became a student of the Middle Temple, which Inn called him to the Bar at the end of 1870. He was thus 25 years of age when "called," which was, in those days, rather above the average age when students became barristers. During his early days in the Temple as a law student, he found time to do some reviewing for *The Morning Post*, and he also contributed art criticisms to *The Leeds Mercury*. During his early years at the Bar, when practice was slow in coming, he wrote three or four novels, one of which he dedicated to the great Carlyle, and was praised by the almost equally great Disraeli. It was Carlyle, strange to say, who diverted Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE from the thorny paths of literature, or at all events, urged him to stick to the law. Forwarding one of his novels to Carlyle, the latter sent back the caustic reply: "Devote yourself to some real work." Accordingly, Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE did so, and with great professional success.

Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE's contributions to legal literature were both valuable and important. He published, in 1871, the "Medical Jurisprudence of Insanity," which ran into an American edition, published at San Francisco. In 1872 "The Law of Carriers" came from his pen, and early in 1874 he had his reward in being appointed Registrar and Secretary to the Railway Commissioners, less than four years from his call to the Bar. But it was in 1880, when his "Law of Railways" appeared that he made his name, and established his reputation as an authority on railway law. In 1896 he wrote "The Law of Compensation," which deals with the compulsory purchase of land. He also wrote a work on "Usages and Customs" and a treatise on "Water Supply."

In later life, in 1916, Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE wrote his reminiscences, "Forty Years at the Bar," which were, of course, racy and interesting, but unfortunately marred by rather cutting things about people, living and dead, which had much better been left unsaid. While Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE had the gift of brilliant repartee, his retorts were at times unnecessarily bitter, and it could not, with truth, be said that he was popular with, or even liked by, his professional brethren. In fact, it used to be said of him that he had an undue share of what is called "northern rudeness." As an example of this, the story runs that an opposing counsel once accused him of having been born in a madhouse, which, while true, was far from polite, and certainly the accident of his place of birth was no fault of his. Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE sneeringly replied: "The statement is perfectly true, but I was discharged cured. If my learned friend had been there, he would have been there yet."

Again, addressing a Committee of the House of Lords, Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE said: "I think I can make this clear to the meanest capacity." "BALFOUR BROWNE," said Mr. JEUNE, afterwards Sir FRANCIS JEUNE, who was opposing him, for whom he had little respect, "remember whom you are addressing." This was said in a voice sufficiently loud for their Lordships to hear. "I need scarcely say, my Lords," observed Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE, "that I was referring to my learned friend, Mr. JEUNE." In 1917 he published "Recollections, Literary and Political."

Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE received his first Parliamentary brief in 1874, and his fees in that case amounted to 634 guineas. Next year his Parliamentary practice brought him 300 guineas, and in the third year 3,000 guineas. When anyone asked him about his later fabulous income—which in some years, it is said, exceeded £40,000—all that Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE would vouchsafe was: "Providence looked after me after that." In recent years his income exceeded that of any Parliamentary barrister of his time, and probably that of any time. He was briefed, on one side

or other, in all the great Parliamentary Bills that passed through Parliament. He was the leading authority on railway law in the country, and was leading counsel at the Parliamentary Bar, and in the Railway Commissioners' Court. He held the Parliamentary retainers of the Great Northern Railway Company, the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company, the North British, and the Glasgow and South Western Railway Companies. He was perhaps the most prominent municipal lawyer of his time, and he held general Parliamentary retainers from, among others, the Corporations of Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Leeds, Sheffield, Salford, Birmingham and Bristol. He was also the leading counsel for all the important Electrical Power Bills, and represented the promoters of the Manchester Ship Canal. In the exhaustive enquiry into the Railway Rates, heard before the late Lord BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH and Sir COURTENAY BOYLE, which lasted 87 days, his speech alone occupied four days. In that case he represented some thirty-six different clients, including traders, corporations and individuals. His "opening" in the London County Council Water Purchase Bill in 1895, occupied two entire days.

Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE showed he was willing to abandon his enormous practice as long ago as 1906, by contesting his native Dumfriesshire in the Unionist interest, but he was defeated by the Liberal candidate, Mr. P. A. MOLTEÑO; and again in 1910, at East Bradford, where he was also unsuccessful. Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE married the third daughter of the late Lord Justice LUSH. Like his brethren at the Parliamentary Bar, it could not be said Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE was a great lawyer, but he was unrivalled in the way he "opened" a case and got the right side of his Committee at the very start, while he excelled in his examination of witnesses, and his ruthless and remorseless "cross," especially of "expert" witnesses, of whose failings he was fully cognizant, and indeed, a master. To the ordinary witness, he was a terror in "cross," and no Parliamentary counsel exceeded him in the way he put his back into every case he had, and he ungrudgingly gave of his best, of his great professional skill, to each and every client. He was a Benefactor of the Middle Temple, and for a year its treasurer, and in the latter office he certainly succeeded in holding in check the unfortunate asperity of his disposition and nature, and he filled the office and discharged the duties thereof with acceptance and satisfaction. It has been said that, with all his professional success, Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE was a disappointed man, but the future of the Parliamentary Barrister hardly ever ends in a Judgeship, and they have to make hay while the sun shines, which Mr. BALFOUR BROWNE certainly did with astonishing success.

Lawyers and the Professional Spirit.

Professor Graham Wallas, in that fascinating study of social life recently published by him, to which he has given the name of "Our Social Heritage,"* has made an attack on lawyers, as well as other professional classes, of a distinctly novel kind. It has hitherto been the pride of the professions that their members possess, as a body, certain characteristics not to be found in tradesmen or men of business as a class. The latter are assumed to be money-making and self-advertising, regarding all things from the standpoint of the "cash nexus," buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market, and leaving out of account in their daily life the larger social interests and the general welfare. But the professional has plumed himself on having a professional "code" which raises him to a higher ethical plane. Money is not everything; he may not advertise, and he must do *gratis* certain kinds of philanthropic work. His standing in his profession depends on many things, not merely the amount of money he can make. He must conform to professional etiquette and a rigorous code of honour. In other words, an element of *status* as distinct from mere contract is the characteristic of every one of the great professions—Law, Medicine, the Church, the Universities, and the Civil Service.

But Professor Graham Wallas, without quite saying so in express terms, turns all this boast of the professional into a

* "Our Social Heritage," by Professor Graham Wallas, author of "Human Nature in Politics" and "The Great Society": George Allen & Unwin, Limited.

charge of anti-social tendencies against him. He implies, without quite saying so, that every profession is a Trade Union, setting out to seek its own class interest regardless of the public interests, and forming a jealous monopoly to secure that interest. Trade or business, on the other hand, except when a "ring" or "corner" has been formed, is open and competitive—a fair field and no favour for every entrant into the race. The Professions form, as it were, Guilds impregnated with the spirit of Syndicalism and Sovietism which the Trade Unions have only copied from them. Indeed, they differ from the latter, not in spirit or in overt anti-social acts, but simply in the fact that each profession has already secured its *privilegium* or monopoly as a matter of legal right protected by the courts, whereas the workman has to obtain his by violence and collective action. But the worker looks with admiration and envy on the success of the professional guilds, is following in their footsteps, and is trying to set up a form of Guild-Socialism, in which the Trade Unions will tyrannize over and dictate to the public much as—Professor Graham Wallas assumes—the privileged professionals have long been doing. Indeed, the learned Professor condemns Guild-Socialism, as opposed to State-Socialism, not on any of the usual grounds, but because he sees in Guild-Socialism on the part of the workers an addition to what he regards as the despotism of the Professional Guilds. Altogether the conception is clever and daring.

We cannot spare space to follow Professor Graham Wallas in his attack on the professions other than the Law. A brief note of his points in connection with them must suffice. Medicine he accuses of a sordid commercialism most hurtful to the patient and the public; the doctors, he believes, simply boycott any intruder in a district, however brilliant, who does not buy his practice; they accept with open arms any noodle who does; and this arrangement has no other object except to make practices saleable and conserve a profitable monopoly. The Clergy lay emphasis on their special sacerdotal and sacramental divine privileges in the Church, and refuse to share these with the outsider on whom hands have not been laid; they build up a system of ritual and superstition because these popular modes of religious manifestation enhance most their own status. The Teachers are out for salaries and social status; they rigorously shut out the unorthodox private teacher or the unacademic scholar. Herbert Spencer and Beattie Crozier, as we all know, although the Professor does not mention their names, have always been discredited by the academic world because their philosophies were built up outside academic walls. The Civil Service strive by every means in their power to gain for the functionary, in all his grades, a greater freedom from public control and greater benefits at the public expense. Such are the indictments of Professor Wallas, not so much expressed as very cleverly insinuated and implied. An answer might be given to most of these charges, but we must go on to his attack on lawyers.

The nature of the Professor's criticism of the legal profession will by now have been guessed by astute readers. Both Bar and Solicitors are equally banned by him with bell and book and candle. Lawyers are narrow, selfish monopolists, eagerly desirous of doing all they can to enhance their earnings at the expense of the public. The division of the profession into two he considers to be merely a device adopted to duplicate the amount of work done in every case and hence to defraud the layman of double fees. The distinction between Silk and Stuff, the division into circuits, the limits of Sessions: all these are similar dodges adopted to create a monopoly and stifle competition. And so on with all the rules as to costs, fees, and etiquette of every kind. Indeed, Professor Wallas is obviously one of those people who cannot understand the old objection of the Bar to the admission of women on any other grounds than the desire to prevent additional competition. Sentiment, romance, tradition, belief in difference of sex-sphere; he cannot understand how these things, and not self-interest, have made most plain men, in the past, object to the presence of women in the pulpit or the forum. And so on with all the old customs of the Inns of Court; the idea that these are preserved from a genuine love of the archaic, a real reverence for time and tradition, a romantic clinging to that which is not merely material or commercial—all this seems never to have crossed the Professor's mind. It is all a sign of mere monopoly, mere desire to increase the expenses of admission to the profession, in our distinguished critic's vision.

Professor Graham Wallas is not very familiar with the details of either branch of the legal profession, and this leads him, occasionally, into absurdities so pedantic that we should have believed them impossible. For example, he solemnly arraigns the whole legal profession for antagonism to Trade Unionists because some paragraph in the *Law Times* (which he calls the official paper of the solicitors—a distinction which, we imagined, if it belongs to anyone, belongs rather to ourselves) upbraided artisans, during the war, for objecting to "dilution." Again, he goes on to contrast the patriotism of the artisans, who accepted war-time dilution by women and unskilled labour, with the

unpatriotic spirit of the Bar who, he says, refused to admit women or clerks to practise during the war. The humour of this, of course, is delightful. It is like accusing the Hospital-Surgeons of monopoly because they did not take steps for turning nurses into operating surgeons for the duration of the war. We need hardly say that the Bar, even during the absence of the young men in the war, stood in no need of "dilution"; it was full, as at all other times, of competent elderly men without practice and only too ready to do any work that might come their way. We may also add that the admission of women as students would have been useless, since they could not have attained the learning necessary for practice until long after the war had concluded. But this, we imagine, must really be obvious to every lay-reader of intelligence who dips into the Professor's book. The unpracticality and unreality of this charge, we fancy, must be attributed solely to the fundamental pedantry which marks the academic mind in all except its very ablest members.

But while the attack of Professor Graham Wallas on barristers and solicitors shows an utter failure to grasp the inside of the legal profession, due to lack of experience and, we fear, also to lack of real imagination and of sympathy; and while we must class it with that futile production of Mr. H. G. Wells, on the "Soul of a Bishop," as an example of the denseness of comprehension sometimes found in really clever men; yet it may be admitted that lawyers can learn something from his criticism. It is well to remember that we are essentially a "Guild," and a close corporation. It is well to remember that we have privileges and that we must justify them. They cannot be justified as a right to take larger fees or costs from the public. They can only be justified in so far as they maintain a high civic spirit, a clean, honest and straightforward standard of professional dealing, an absence of graspingness where money is concerned, and a noble willingness to defend the weak, to protect the innocent, and to secure *Justitia fiat, ruat cælum*.

Review.

The Annual Practice.

THE ANNUAL PRACTICE, 1922. Being a Collection of the Statutes, Orders and Rules relating to the General Practice, Procedure and Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, with Notes, etc. By RICHARD WHITE, Master of the Supreme Court, GEORGE ANTHONY KING, M.A., Master of the Supreme Court (Taxing), and FRANCIS A. STRINGER, late of the Central Office, Royal Courts of Justice. Sweet & Maxwell, Ltd. Stevens & Son, Ltd. 40s. net.

We are not surprised that under the present conditions of printing the publishers of the White Book have refrained from re-issuing Vol. II (Forms, Statutes, etc.) at present, and have contented themselves with inserting in the edition for 1922 a "Noter-up" printed on one side only which will enable Vol. II of the 1921 edition to be brought up to date. Moreover, the termination of the war on 1st September last has been made the occasion for discontinuing the publication of the Courts (Emergency Powers) Acts and Rules, though, in fact, by virtue of the War Emergency Laws (Continuance) Act, 1920, the Acts continue for twelve months after the termination of the war. Of the new Rules which are printed in this edition, the most important are the new Poor Persons Rules, which came into force on 1st January, 1921, and form Rules 22-31 of Order 16. But the most interesting new feature in the book is the attempt which has been made to collect in one section (pp. 1209 to 1265) all the notes on costs and arrange them under alphabetical headings, their use being facilitated by cross-references from other parts of the work. It has not been possible to complete this task in the present edition, but the editors, who refer to costs as "a subject of considerable practical importance"—some would say the only one—hope to complete it in the next. The editors have had assistance and suggestions from many quarters and, with the new White Book at hand, the practitioner can embark confidently on his work for the coming legal year.

Books of the Week.

Legal History.—The Student's Legal History. By R. STORRY DEANS, Barrister-at-Law. 4th Edition. Stevens & Sons, Ltd. 15s.

Costs.—Guide to the Preparation, Delivery and Taxation of Bills of Costs with Precedents of Bills of Costs in all the Divisions of the High Court of Justice, etc., etc., and Notes and Decisions thereon (Pridmore and Scott). 12th Edition. By W. J. BANNER and A. W. PORTER, both of The Supreme Court Taxing Office, Royal Courts of Justice. Waterlow and Sons, Ltd. 63s. net.

Practice.—The Annual Practice, 1922. Being a collection of the Statutes, Orders and Rules relating to the General Practice, Procedure and Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, with Notes, etc. By RICHARD WHITE and GEORGE ANTHONY KING, M.A., Masters of the Supreme Court, and FRANCIS A. STRINGER, late of the Central Office. 40th Annual Issue. Sweet & Maxwell, Ltd. Stevens & Sons, Ltd. 40s. net.

Practice.—The ABC Guide to the Practice of the Supreme Court, 1922. 17th Edition. By F. R. P. STRINGER, of the Central Office. Sweet and Maxwell, Ltd. Stevens & Sons, Ltd. 8s. 6d. net.

Partnership.—The Law of Partnership. By J. ANDREW STRAHAN, M.A., LL.B., and NORMAN H. OLDHAM, B.A., LL.B., Barristers-at-Law. 2nd Edition by J. A. STRAHAN. Sweet & Maxwell, Ltd. 10s. net.

Agricultural Holdings.—Jackson's Agricultural Holdings. Being the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1908-1921, with Introduction and Explanatory Notes and Forms, together with a Manual on Tenant-Right Valuation. By W. HANBURY AGOS, M.A., LL.M., Barrister-at-Law. 5th Edition. Sweet & Maxwell, Ltd. 11s. 6d. net.

Stamp Duties.—The Law of Stamp Duties on Deeds and other Instruments. By E. N. ALPE. Revised and Enlarged by ARTHUR REGINALD RUDALL, Barrister-at-Law, with Notes on Practice by HERBERT WILLIAM JORDAN. 16th Edition. Jordan & Sons, Ltd. 15s. net.

New Orders, &c.

Board of Trade Orders.

THE MIXED ARBITRAL TRIBUNALS.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE MIXED ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL BETWEEN THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND BULGARIA UNDER ARTICLE 188 OF THE TREATY OF NEUILLY-SUR-SEINE.

Notice is hereby given, that the Rules of Procedure of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal between the British Empire and Bulgaria have been published as Statutory Rules and Orders, 1921, No. 1458, and copies of the same can be purchased (price 5d. net), either directly or through any bookseller, from His Majesty's Stationery Office, at the following addresses:—Imperial House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2; 28, Abingdon Street, London, S.W.1; 37, Peter Street, Manchester; 1, St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff; 23, Forth Street, Edinburgh; or from E. Ponsoby, Limited, 116, Grafton Street, Dublin, or at the Secretariat of the Tribunal, Winchester House, 21, St. James's Square, London, S.W.1.

MIXED ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL BETWEEN THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND BULGARIA.

The following announcement is made by the Board of Trade:—

In pursuance of Article 188 of the Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine, the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal between the British Empire and Bulgaria has been constituted and is about to commence work in London. The President is Mr. B. C. J. Loder, LL.D., Judge of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands; the British Member is Mr. Heber Hart, K.C., LL.D., and the Bulgarian Member is Mena. Alexander Ludkanoff, Member of the National Assembly, and formerly Secretary of State in Bulgaria.

As the system of Clearing Offices has not been adopted between the United Kingdom and Bulgaria, claims in respect of disputed debts due by Bulgarians to British subjects will be dealt with directly by this Tribunal. It has also jurisdiction under Section IV ("Property, Rights and Interests"), Section V ("Contracts, Prescriptions, Judgments"), Section VI ("Mixed Arbitral Tribunal"), and Section VII ("Industrial Property") of Part X of the above Treaty.

By the Treaty the High Contracting Parties have agreed that their courts and authorities shall render to the Tribunal direct all the assistance in their power, particularly as regards transmitting notices and collecting evidence; and they have also agreed to regard the decisions of the Tribunal as final and conclusive and to render them binding upon their nationals.

Mr. Claud Mullins, barrister-at-law, is the British Secretary.

[Gazette, 20th September.

GERMAN REPARATION RECOVERY (No. 12) ORDER, 1921, DATED 29TH SEPTEMBER, 1921, MADE BY THE BOARD OF TRADE.

The Board of Trade, in pursuance of the powers conferred upon them by Section 5 of the German Reparation (Recovery) Act, 1921, and of all other powers enabling them in that behalf, upon the recommendation of a Committee constituted under Section 5 of the said Act, hereby make the following Order:—

1. This Order may be cited as the German Reparation Recovery (No. 12) Order, 1921.

2. Any Article of the following description shall be exempt from the provisions of the said Act, that is to say, any Article in regard to which it is proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs and Excise that after being consigned to Germany by a person or persons not resident in Germany, it is thence consigned to the United Kingdom, provided that the said Commissioners are satisfied that it has not undergone any process of manufacture in Germany, and has not whilst in Germany passed out of the ownership of the person or persons by whom it was consigned thereto.

29th September.

[Gazette, 4th October.

Mr. William Baildon Craven, of The Oakes, Lidget-park, Roundhay, Leeds, of Messrs. Craven & Clegg, solicitors, Leeds, for many years a member of the Committee of the Leeds Law Society and President in 1887, left estate of gross value £30,999.

Societies.

Service at Westminster Abbey.

WEDNESDAY, 12TH OCTOBER, 1921.

On the occasion of the re-opening of the Law Courts, a Special Service will be held at Westminster Abbey, at 11.45 a.m., which the Lord Chancellor and His Majesty's Judges will attend.

In order to ascertain what space will be required, members of the Junior Bar wishing to be present are requested to send their names to the Secretary of the General Council of the Bar, 5, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C., before 4 p.m. on Tuesday, the 11th October.

Barristers attending the Service must wear robes. All should be at the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey (Dean's Yard Entrance), where robing accommodation will be provided, not later than 11.30 a.m.

A limited number of seats in the South Transept will be reserved for friends of members of the Bar, to whom two tickets of admission will be issued on application to the Secretary of the General Council of the Bar.

No tickets are required for admission to the North Transept, which is open to the public.

GORDON HEWART,
Attorney-General.

Westminster Cathedral.

A Votive Mass of the Holy Ghost (The "Red Mass") will be said on the occasion of the re-opening of the Royal Courts of Justice, on Wednesday, the 12th of October, 1921, at 11.30 a.m. His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop will assist. A robing-room will be at Counsel's disposal at the Cathedral.

The Law Society.

PROVINCIAL MEETING.

The 39th provincial meeting of the Law Society has been held at the invitation of the Scarborough Law Society, at Scarborough, during the present week.

RECEPTION.

On Monday evening the members of the Society and the ladies who accompanied them were received by the Mayor (Alderman M. T. Whittaker, J.P.) and Mayoress at the Town Hall.

BUSINESS MEETING.

The members met at the Grand Hotel on Tuesday, when the Mayor took the chair and welcomed the Society to Scarborough. He then vacated the position and Mr. J. J. D. Botterell (London, President of the Law Society), presided during the remainder of the meeting.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

The PRESIDENT read his address as follows:—

It is a great honour and pleasure to me to find myself occupying the Presidential Chair on this, the first occasion on which the Law Society has held its Provincial Meeting at Scarborough.

Many of my professional associations are with this North Country, and I am very glad of this opportunity of revisiting it. I should like also, before proceeding to the several questions dealt with in my Address, to express to the Scarborough Law Society and its officers the very sincere appreciation which is felt by the Law Society as a whole, and particularly by those members of it who have found themselves able to attend here on this occasion, for the kindness and enterprise which have prompted the Scarborough Society and its officers to invite the Law Society to hold their meeting here. We realise fully the enormous amount of hard work which a meeting of this character throws upon those called upon to arrange it, and we are deeply grateful for all that has been done for us.

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE.

You will remember that at a Special General Meeting of this Society, held in January, 1918, one of my ablest predecessors in this chair (Mr. Samuel Garrett) delivered an address in which he advocated the establishment of a new Department of State charged with the duty of "focusing, co-ordinating and systematising the whole Legal business of the Country." He thought that these duties should be removed from the Lord Chancellor and committed to a Ministry of Justice presided over by a Minister, wholly divorced himself from judicial functions, but charged with the duty of seeing that those functions were properly fulfilled, and provided with machinery fitted for their needs. Mr. Garrett made out an excellent case for the creation of a Ministry of Justice assuming that we were framing a new, or re-casting our present, Constitution.

Nothing of a concrete nature, so far, has emanated from Mr. Garrett's proposals. It is true that soon after the delivery of his address a departmental committee entitled "The Machinery of Government Committee," presided over by Lord Haldane, took this subject amongst others into consideration, and reported upon it. The Committee itself was appointed by the then existing Minister of Reconstruction who, fortunately or unfortunately for us, no longer exists. The Committee considered that the Lord Chancellor should still continue to conduct many of the matters for which he has always been responsible, but they thought it was essential

that the general work of administration in connection with Justice should pass to a Minister of Justice. There seemed in their opinion to be no reason why the Home Secretary should not become this Minister and be relieved of functions pertaining to other National Services. The Committee thought that the Lord Chancellor should be allowed a staff sufficient to enable him to keep himself closely informed on all matters necessary to enable him to act as principal legal adviser of the Government. They thought that his work should be in close and frequent relation with that of the Minister of Justice, and expressed the view that the Lord Chancellor and the Minister of Justice when constituted ought to be able to work closely together, and they saw no reason why this should be difficult. Their suggestion was that the Minister of Justice should sit in the House of Commons, and be accessible to those who had suggestions to make. Besides his administration of the staffs of the various Courts in England the Committee considered that his Department should contain experts, charged with the duty of watching over the interests of law reform, and of studying the development of the subject at home and abroad.

The suggestion that part of the work of the Lord Chancellor connected with the Administration of Justice should be allocated to the Home Secretary, the latter then becoming the Minister of Justice, does not seem to me to be calculated to assist the work at present performed either by the Lord Chancellor or the Home Secretary, and would, in my opinion, lead inevitably to friction between their respective departments. It is incontrovertible that it is one, if not the most important, of the duties of a State to provide for and safeguard the due administration of Justice and all which that expression connotes. In this country we are fortunate in having that administration controlled by a Minister of the exalted rank of the Lord Chancellor. The Lord Chancellor is the oldest in standing of the Ministers of the Crown, and, as the Committee to which I have referred correctly state, the office of Lord Chancellor is one deeply rooted in the traditions of the Nation. Throughout the world, the absolute impartiality and integrity of British Justice, and the honesty of its administration, are fully recognised, and it is only fair to attribute this happy state of affairs in a large measure to the system which it is now proposed to alter.

One of the great merits of the present system is, that we can always rely upon the Minister responsible for the due and proper administration of Justice being a lawyer of outstanding ability, and thoroughly acquainted with legal matters, whereas if the proposed scheme were carried out the Minister of Justice might not be a lawyer at all, but merely a successful politician with no previous actual experience of legal administration, which in my judgment would be a very undesirable, if not a hazardous, possibility.

In the Lord Chancellor we have to-day in fact, although not in name, a very efficient Minister of Justice performing satisfactorily the highly important duties of that office. I am not an advocate for scrapping an existing system, which has so much to recommend it, simply to please one's sense of what might be a more symmetrical system. The argument that in many other countries the Constitution provides a Ministry of Justice, is not to my mind at all conclusive that a new department under that name is desirable here.

We at the Law Society have a great deal to do with the Lord Chancellor and his permanent Secretary, and whatever may have been the experience in the more or less distant past, I am satisfied that, nowadays, any one competent to make suggestions for the improvement of the Administration of Justice can be certain that any such suggestions will be fairly considered if submitted to the Lord Chancellor.

The Council have made from time to time many such suggestions which on every occasion have been promptly and sympathetically considered by the Lord Chancellor of the day; and in some cases adopted.

It is, however, admitted on all hands that the duties and responsibilities now imposed on the Lord Chancellor are larger and more complex than any man, however able and energetic he may be, should be called upon to undertake. This being the general opinion, I venture to suggest, as an alternative to the ambitious and drastic proposals put forward, that the Lord Chancellor should remain, as at present, the Minister of Justice, and that, in the first place, he should be relieved of such of his present duties as are entirely unconnected with the Administration of Justice, and with his State and political functions, by transferring what I may call these outside duties to one or other of the existing Departments of State. And, in the second place, that his Secretarial staff should be adequately increased.

I do not, of course, know the views of the Lord Chancellor upon the subject, or whether this suggestion, if carried out, would sufficiently relieve him. I make it, therefore, with great diffidence, but I think that in some such course as I suggest might be found the best solution of an extremely important and interesting problem.

LAW OF PROPERTY BILL.

Referring to this Bill, I do not propose again to deal with its provisions in detail, as my predecessor, Mr. Morton, in his address to us at Liverpool, gave us a valuable exposition of its main provisions and effects. I think, however, that a short summary of the Bill, which, if passed, will cause a very considerable alteration in and simplification of the practice of conveyancing, might be useful.

I am to a large extent indebted to my friend Sir Walter Trower, who has taken a keen interest in the Bill, and whose intimate knowledge of the subject entitles him to speak with great authority, for the following summary of the provisions of the Bill:

Part I assimilates so far as possible the transfer of land to the transfer of stock by providing that there should be simple conveyances from A to B, all subsidiary interests being kept off the title.

Part II amends and enlarges the powers of a tenant for life under the Settled Land Acts so as, in effect, to give him the same powers of sale, leasing and disposal as an owner in fee simple, subject only to the preservation of capital in the hands of the Trustees.

Part III amends the Conveyancing Acts so as to bring them into line with the provisions of Part I, and to cure defects discovered in the working of those Acts.

Part IV amends the Trustee Acts with the same objects.

Parts V and VI abolish copyhold and customary tenures, a very desirable, and in fact, necessary reform, having regard to the main purpose of the Bill.

Part VII converts perpetually renewable leaseholds into terms of 2,000 years.

Part VIII makes the real and personal estate of an intestate devolve together.

In the result (1) the surviving spouse where there is issue, takes the personal chattels and a first charge of £1,000—which in more than 90 per cent. of cases will exhaust the intestate's estate.

(2) The surviving spouse takes a life interest in the residue if there is no issue, or a life interest in one-half if there is issue.

(3) The issue take the residue on attaining the age of 21 or on marriage.

Parts IX and X make the amendments to the Land Transfer Acts 1875 and 1897 found necessary by the experience of the working of those Acts. Incidentally they provide that the extension of compulsory registration to the country shall be postponed for ten years from the commencement of the Act, and shall not then be capable of taking effect until an enquiry has been held and a report made in favour of the extension, at which enquiry all necessary parties are to be heard. The extension also requires the positive approval of both Houses of Parliament.

Part XI contains general definitions and the schedules contain machinery for the purpose of carrying into effect the principles embodied in the Bill.

As the Bill originally stood the clause making registration compulsory was to come into effect immediately on the passing of the Bill. It provided that an Order in Council extending the system of compulsory registration to any county could be made in draft, that upon such draft Order being made a County Council or a local Law Society could demand a public enquiry, and that after the enquiry if a favourable report was obtained, the Order was to be laid on the table of both Houses, when, if an address in either House was carried, the Order could be made forthwith.

The view which the Council took was that if the law of real and personal estate were assimilated, and if the provisions of the Bill were passed under which all settlements were kept off the title and only transfers of the legal estate had to be enquired into, registration of title would become entirely unnecessary. We represented these facts to the Lord Chancellor, and as a result we were able to arrive at an agreement with him to the effect, not merely that the Act should not come into force until the 1st January, 1923, but that the provisions with regard to compulsory registration should be postponed for a period of ten years from that date.

Before acquiescing in this compromise the Council were careful to take the best expert advice available, and they also submitted the question individually to the Provincial Law Societies with the result that we are confident that the terms which have been arranged are satisfactory in the interest as well of the public as of the profession.

The Council informed the Lord Chancellor that they and the Provincial Law Societies were opposed to the extension of officialism and bureaucracy and the great expense they would involve, and that they hoped before the ten years expired it would be established beyond question that the law, as amended, would meet every requirement, and accordingly that the compulsory registration provision might be repealed. They stated also that they would be content at the expiration of the trial period to abide by the result of a full enquiry into the merits of the two systems.

The Lord Chancellor, in reply, stated that he was willing in that spirit to leave that which proved the best system to prevail in the end, and in the meantime that he welcomed and appreciated the support of the Law Society.

I regret that owing to the pressure of time it became impossible to pass the Bill through the House of Commons during the recent session of Parliament. There can be little doubt, however, that the Bill will be brought forward again at the earliest possible opportunity.

TRIBUNALS OF ENQUIRY (EVIDENCE) ACT.

One matter which I feel it incumbent upon me to mention is the trend of modern legislation to set up extra-Judicial Tribunals and to exclude barristers and solicitors from audience before them. Several recent Statutes, such as the Coal Industries (Commission) Act of 1919, the Wages Act of 1918, and the Industrial Courts Act of 1920 display this tendency, but unquestionably the most glaring instance of it is to be found in the Tribunals of Enquiry (Evidence) Act of the present year.

The Bill upon which the Act is founded was introduced by the Government for the purpose of setting up a Tribunal to deal with certain questions which had arisen at the Ministry of Munitions. It provided that the Tribunal should have the powers of the High Court with regard to the attendance of witnesses, compelling the production of documents, and punishment for contempt, and it provided that the Tribunal should have power to allow, or refuse to allow, the public or any portion of the public to be present at any of the proceedings, and to authorise the representation before them of any person appearing to them to be interested to be by Counsel, or Solicitor,

or otherwise; or to refuse to allow such representation. I submit that a Bill containing these provisions would have been thoroughly objectionable from a constitutional point of view, even had it been limited to the particular enquiry with regard to which it was intended to deal, but the Government were not satisfied thus to limit it. It occurred to them that possibly, and probably from time to time in the future, they or some other Government would find it desirable to designate some particular matter as of urgent public importance and to appoint a Tribunal to deal with it. They, therefore, extended the Bill accordingly and proposed to confer upon not merely the Tribunal in question at the moment but all future Tribunals the same powers as those to which I have referred.

The Bill as thus altered was introduced into the House of Commons on a Monday and passed through all its stages in that House on the following day. Fortunately, it was possible for the Law Society to intervene before it reached the House of Lords, and as a result certain amendments were introduced into the Bill which to some extent had the effect of modifying its most objectionable provisions.

The point, however, which I desire to make is, that it is exceedingly undesirable in the public interest that these extra-Judicial Tribunals should be extended more than is absolutely necessary, and that if they are appointed the parties called upon to appear before them should not be deprived of their rights to appear by ordinary constitutional methods.

Another subject to which I should like to draw attention is the very obscure wording frequently indulged in by the draughtsmen of modern Acts of Parliament. In this connection I might instance, by way of example, the Finance Acts and the Rent Restrictions Acts, the interpretation of some of the clauses of which is the despair, not only of the practitioner, but also of the Judges themselves. Surely it is within the power of the learned draughtsmen, who are gentlemen of great ability and experience, to express the meaning and intention of Acts of Parliament in ordinary English language, readily understandable by the community at large. The practice of legislating by reference to other Acts of Parliament seems also objectionable (although in many cases no doubt practically unavoidable) as causing unnecessary labour to those having to advise upon them, and occasionally bringing about results not contemplated by the Legislature.

SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION.

My predecessor, Mr. Morton, in his address to you at Liverpool last year, dealt to some extent with the subject of Solicitors' remuneration and particularly he advocated the desirability of legalising more fully the delivery of lump sum Bills of Cost.

You will remember that in June of 1920, the Rule Committee, under the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, 1881, made an order authorising the delivery of a lump sum Bill, but inserted in the order a proviso that the client could require the delivery of a detailed Bill of Charge if such demand were made within twelve months of the delivery of the lump sum Bill or within one month after its payment whereupon the detailed Bill would become subject to taxation in the ordinary way. This order has to some extent, I believe been made use of, and it is of course an improvement on the old law that nothing was a "bill of costs charges and disbursements" within the meaning of the Solicitors' Act, 1843, unless it set out the ordinary priced and detailed items. As you know subject to the Order of June, 1920, a lump sum Bill may be challenged by the client at any time, and its taxation is not limited to twelve months after its delivery.

Solicitors are practically the only professional body who cannot claim for their services a fee in their opinion commensurate with the skill, labour and responsibility which those services involve.

The practice of delivering a lump sum Bill, now extensively followed, should be legalised, always reserving to the client for a limited time after delivery the right of having the Bill submitted to a Taxing Master if the client considers the amount excessive, in which event the Solicitor would have to justify the charge before payment could be enforced. The Council therefore drafted a Bill, to give a Solicitor the right when delivering his charges of electing to be remunerated by a single fee. The Bill provided that this fee should be subject to taxation if the client so desired but provided that on taxation the Taxing Master should have regard (amongst other things) to the skill, labour, experience, special exertion and responsibility involved in the business on the part of the Solicitor. The Bill does not propose to alter the existing law in cases where any costs are recoverable from the client by any person other than the client's own Solicitor or payable to the client by any other person. This practice of a lump sum Bill on the one hand would save the Solicitor in the vast majority of cases the time and trouble of preparing involved and lengthy detailed bills of costs, the preparation of which is paid for by the client, and the client on the other hand the time and consequent irritation of reading them.

When in June 1920 the Lord Chancellor acquiesced in the order to which I have referred, he stated that experience of it would assist him in considering whether it should be extended, and he mentioned the period of twelve months as the time he would like to name for the purpose. Accordingly at the beginning of the summer, the Council approached his Lordship with a request that he would consider the matter again and the Lord Chancellor at once replied that in order to justify him in introducing legislation, it would be necessary to appoint a Committee to advise him on the subject. A Committee was appointed and has, I believe, taken a considerable amount of evidence. It is presided over by Mr. Justice Russell, and Sir William Plender, the Public Trustee, and my predecessor in this Chair, amongst other well-known business men, were appointed members of it.

Whatever may be the result of their deliberations, the profession is indebted to the Lord Chancellor for his sympathetic consideration of our request and for appointing such a thoroughly representative Committee to enquire into it.

FEES TO COUNSEL.

You will probably remember that during the whole of the year 1913 down to the date of the outbreak of war, discussions took place between the Law Society and the General Council of the Bar, with regard to Counsel's fees and particularly with regard to that rule which the Bar have always laid down, that no matter what may be the fee marked on the Leader's Brief, the Junior's Brief shall be marked with a fee of two-thirds of the Leader's fee.

The only definite outcome of the discussions was a ruling on the part of the Bar Council that in cases where two Leaders within the Bar (i.e., two King's Counsel) are briefed, that fact is to be a special circumstance entitling the second Leader and the Junior to accept, if they think fit, fees which do not bear the accustomed proportion of two-thirds to that of the first Leader, so long as the fees they accept are of such an amount as would ordinarily be marked, having regard to the importance of the case, and as between themselves bear the accustomed proportion.

The Bar Council, it is true, issued the further useful notification that they did not recognise any claim that the fees marked on the brief delivered for one party to an action must be the same as those marked on a brief delivered for an opponent in the same action.

This last notification was, as I have said, a useful one, because as you and I know, there can be no doubt whatever that barristers' clerks had a way, and as far as I can make out, still have, of ascertaining which barrister is opposing them, and telling his clerk what fee has been marked on their brief, so as to give him an opportunity of demanding the same fee. No one, however, on behalf of the Bar has ever made a definite claim that the barrister on one side is entitled to the same fee as the barrister on the other. The Bar Council therefore in making the notification referred to, in no way altered any Bar rule, but merely, by their notification, declared the position.

The Council were not satisfied as to the sufficiency of the ruling of the Bar Council of the 10th June 1913, which dealt only, and that not satisfactorily, with the case in which two Leaders and a Junior were engaged, but made no modification in cases with which we are mostly familiar, in which perhaps a Junior of ordinary standing, before being briefed, and although willing to accept a fee which was on the face of it adequate, finding himself led by a Senior who had demanded a very high fee, considered himself bound by the etiquette of the Bar to insist upon the fee, which but for this circumstance he would have been quite willing to accept, being raised to two-thirds of that of his Leader.

It is cases such as these which cause real vexation and annoyance to both Solicitor and client, and it is the Solicitor of course who has to bear the brunt of the client's dissatisfaction when, at the end of even a successful litigation, he finds he has to pay a large sum for Counsel's fees disallowed on taxation.

Early in 1914 representations to this effect were made to the Bar Council, when there was discussed the question of whether it would be possible to limit the right of the Junior to a two-thirds proportion of only the ordinary fee in cases where only two Counsel are briefed, and the Leader has demanded and been marked a fee in excess of that which would ordinarily be marked, having regard to the importance of the case. The Council made certain definite suggestions, which I need not go into, varying the Junior's proportion of the Leader's fee.

The General Council of the Bar, or rather the Committee which had the matter under consideration, made certain counter-proposals which differed in principle from those made by the Council of the Law Society, in that the latter had sought to lay it down that special fees, that is to say, fees in excess of those which would be marked to an ordinary Leader, should be disregarded, while the General Council of the Bar were only prepared to consider a modified proportion of those special fees, but declined to consider at all the suggestion that they should be disregarded altogether in arriving at the Junior's fee.

At this stage war broke out. Many Barristers and Solicitors left to serve their country, and it was agreed that the abnormal conditions, created by the war, were such as to render impossible any further discussion or negotiation.

Now that the war has been officially declared to be ended and the Barristers and Solicitors who have survived the struggle are back again at work, I cannot help thinking that the time has arrived when we might with advantage revive the discussion.

A typical case recently occurred in my own practice where my successful client had to pay out of his own pocket, on the costs being taxed, a sum of over £3,000 of disallowed Counsel's fees, mainly incurred by the observance of the rule of etiquette to which I have been taking exception.

SOLICITORS' CLERKS.

You will have seen by a reference to this matter in the Annual Report, that during the past twelve months the Council have been discussing the question of the adequacy of the salaries paid by Solicitors to their Clerks. The matter is one with regard to which I have been specially concerned, in view of the fact that when a Joint Board was set up in London, consisting of representatives of the Law Society and of the clerks in London, they did me the special honour, which I much appreciated, instead of appointing an outside Chairman, of appointing me to that position.

The discussions on the Joint Board were uniformly of the most friendly nature. We issued one or two general intimations to the profession that

where having regard to the large increase in the cost of living (as a result of the war) adequate increases in salary had not already been made, Solicitors should take into careful consideration the increased cost of living and where possible make adequate increases in their clerks' salaries.

On the employers' side of the board we expressed ourselves also perfectly willing to consider and make representations with regard to any individual cases of hardship which might be submitted to the Joint Board. The clerks' representatives, anticipating what they described as possible victimisation, the possibility of which we did not admit, submitted to us a scheme under which every clerk should be placed in one of a number of grades each of which grades should have allocated to it a fixed minimum salary specified in the scheme.

The majority of the Council felt themselves unable to entertain these suggestions. It seemed to them that it was impossible to attach any particular minimum salary, such as suggested, to any particular grade for universal application in the Metropolitan area owing to the differing circumstances of each Solicitor. The earnings of Solicitors themselves varied so considerably that the value of the work, say, of a Managing Clerk in one office, of necessity varied, not according only to his industry and ability, but also by the amount of work in the particular office, so that it was obvious that a Solicitor in a small way of business and only earning himself, perhaps, say, £400 a year could not afford to pay his clerks at the same rate as a Solicitor who was earning, say, £4,000, or even more. They felt that a salary quite fair and reasonable in one office might be excessive in another, and that it was impossible to formulate a scale applicable to Solicitors in large practices, and to those in small practices.

I cannot help thinking also that from the point of view of the clerks, the scheme suggested on their behalf was not altogether to their advantage. The best of clerks are not necessarily of the nature of good wine which improves with age. Many clerks more or less past their work are kept on at a comparatively low wage, who would probably be discharged if the employer felt himself compelled to pay them even the minimum wage suggested for their particular grade. The schemes to which I refer for this and other reasons are calculated, if adopted, to tend to unemployment.

The Council of the Law Society and indeed their constituents, the members in general, are I am sure anxious in every way possible to encourage the good feeling which undoubtedly exists in the profession between employers and employed, and so far as I am concerned I shall endeavour to assist it by every means in my power, as I think myself that some of us are very apt to under-estimate the value of our clerks' services and of the responsible work which they do for us.

At the moment the deliberations of the London Joint Board have arrived at a deadlock, but I am still hopeful that some modified scheme may be suggested, mutually satisfactory to both sides.

Many Solicitors are inclined to resent any outside interference between themselves and their respective staffs and in some cases object to their clerks joining any Federation or Association—I for my part do not share this feeling. The principle of collective bargaining, so long as it is confined within legitimate limits, such as rates of pay and conditions of service, has its advantages, and is now almost universally adopted (although at one time hotly contested) in manufacturing and commercial concerns. Whilst there are obvious difficulties in its extension to professional businesses, yet I do not think that these difficulties should be found insuperable.

The Federation of Law Clerks however, besides this scheme for grading and minimum wages, have been disposed to go further and to put forward claims which cannot be discussed with them because they concern Solicitors alone. I refer to the demand that the qualifications which have always been required for the practice of the Law should be further modified in favour of the clerks. Now I say emphatically that the tendency of a well-governed State should be to increase rather than diminish the qualifications of its lawyers. With this object in view we have recently asked the Lord Chancellor to introduce a Bill, which we have prepared, and which will, if it becomes law, have the effect of raising the standard of the preliminary examination in general knowledge, a matter to which we attach the greatest importance. One of the clauses in the Bill provides for the attendance of articulated clerks, for at least one year before they are admitted, at some recognised school of law, except where special circumstances call for exemption, which in proper cases the appropriate Committee of the Council will be empowered to recommend to the Judges, with whom the final decision rests.

There have been suggestions on the part of the Federation of Law Clerks of some opposition to this Bill, but I cannot help hoping, and indeed believing, that when they have actually seen the Bill they will not only abandon the idea of any such action, but will on consideration, more especially such of them as may have the intention of qualifying themselves for the profession, welcome a proposal which tends to raise the educational standard of the profession which, after all, is, or should be, a learned profession, and so improve its status and increase its value to the community.

FUSION OF THE PROFESSION.

Some few months since a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons entitled "The Legal Practitioners Bill" intended to unify both branches of the legal profession in England and Wales.

It was introduced by a Solicitor and supported amongst others by a Solicitor. I need hardly say that it was not submitted to the Council of the Law Society, who would certainly not have introduced or approved the introduction of such a Bill without in the first instance consulting all the members of the Society, and indeed of the profession.

This subject of fusion has been considered on many occasions in the history of the Law Society, sometimes at Provincial Meetings and sometimes at General Meetings of the Society. Resolutions of a more or less half-hearted nature have been passed sometimes one way and sometimes the other, but I have no hesitation in stating that there is no such public or professional demand as to justify legislation on the subject. At one time there was a certain hardship felt by Solicitors because barristers were entitled to become Solicitors with greater facility than they themselves could go to the Bar. Any such hardship however has long since been removed. We are all aware that in America, in many foreign countries, and in some of our own colonies, Barristers and Solicitors are entitled in common to do all the acts which Barristers and Solicitors together can do here. In practice we know as a fact that in America and elsewhere advocacy is practically reserved to the advocate members of the firm and the remainder of the work is left to those who, like Solicitors in this country, remain for the most part in their offices and interview their clients. If the object of the promoters of the Bill is to reduce legal costs, all I can say is that, from my experience of such costs in other countries, and especially in America, no encouragement is to be found in that direction.

The Bill contained a provision that all judicial offices or public appointments hitherto reserved to one or the other branch of the legal profession, should be open to all legal practitioners as soon as the Bill passed.

Now I certainly agree that we Solicitors do not receive anything like our fair proportion of the more valuable legal appointments, although I am very glad to observe that, only in the last two or three months, Solicitors have been appointed to the positions of Solicitor to the Board of Inland Revenue and Solicitor to the Post Office.

There are many Solicitors quite competent owing to their legal attainments, experience, and social qualifications, to perform admirably the duties discharged by the occupants of minor judicial posts; and it certainly seems inexpedient that the public should continue to be deprived of their services merely because they are Solicitors and not Barristers. The removal of this particular disqualification is however quite a different matter from a fusion of the two branches of the profession.

Some years ago I was instructed by a Foreign Government to report upon the matter I am now discussing. I went into the subject exhaustively and I came to the conclusion that however well a fusion of the two branches might work in other countries, it would not be advantageous in this country either to the public in general, or to Solicitors in particular. One result I think would be to concentrate business in the hands of large firms with many partners to the detriment of Solicitors in small practices.

This Bill has in Parliamentary language been "dropped", thus sharing the fate of many of these eccentric efforts of private members. It is of course undesirable to curtail unduly the right of private members to initiate legislation, but having regard to the high cost of paper, printing, etc., amounting I understand on the average to considerably over £100 for each of these Bills, which expense falls upon the unfortunate taxpayer, some precautions seem to be called for to prevent abuse of the privilege in question.

VACATIONS.

That hardy annual—the Long Vacation—has, as usual, come up for discussion once more. From all I can gather, the Profession is by no means unanimous on the question of whether the Long Vacation should be further shortened. To those fortunate solicitors who browse in the pleasant pastures of a conveyancing practice, the matter is one of indifference, and the same remark, I think, applies to essentially rural practices. On the other hand, those solicitors who carry on a business mainly concerned with the collection of trade and other debts, would probably welcome the total abolition not only of the Long, but all the other Vacations as well. The point really concerns those solicitors who are principally engaged in ordinary litigious matters. I doubt if they think that the Long Vacation should be curtailed. In an extensive practice the first fortnight of the Vacation is taken up in clearing up many outstanding matters arising out of cases which have only just been disposed of by the Courts. The last fortnight is taken up with preparations for the ensuing Sittings, thus leaving a bare six weeks of holiday, which, after all, is not a clear holiday, as in that period Bills of Costs have to be prepared, taxations disposed of by agreement between the respective solicitors, papers sorted out and filed away, the holidays of the staff arranged, and the hundred and one other things well known to solicitors disposed of. In my own experience I have found from these various causes my own vacation occasionally cut down to some three weeks, or even less.

A far more desirable reform than shortening the Long Vacation, in my opinion, would be the equalisation of the Hilary and Trinity Sittings. This can only, I presume, be effected by making Easter a fixed festival, a course to which I see no objection, either on ecclesiastical or other grounds. An early Easter makes the Hilary Sittings very short and the Trinity Sittings unduly long, and vice versa when Easter is late, an undesirable result for many reasons in both cases. There is, I believe, a considerable body of feeling in favour of this reform, and I am glad of this opportunity of expressing my views on the subject.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SOCIETY.

I conclude this address by discussing a question of more domestic interest, but one nevertheless of great importance, and that is, by what means can we increase the membership of the Society? You will find in the Annual Report a short reference to the question whether it would be possible to require that all practising Solicitors should become members of the Law Society.

Although the reference to the matter is a very brief one, it must not be assumed that the consideration which was given it has been in the least degree perfunctory; in fact such consideration has occupied a large part of the deliberations of the Council during the past twelve months.

The advocates for compulsion, led by my friend Mr. Nesbitt, whose valuable labours as Chairman of the Committee considering the subject deserve special mention, put forward as the main object of compulsory membership the more effective control which the Society would then exercise over the conduct of Solicitors. Their proposals were that every Solicitor taking out a practising certificate should, so long as he held that certificate, be and continue to be of necessity a member of the Law Society without election or any other qualification. It was proposed also that the Council should be put in a position to entertain any complaint that a Solicitor had been guilty of conduct discreditable to the profession not amounting to professional misconduct (with which of course the Discipline Committee now deal) with power, if they should be of opinion that such complaint was well founded, to admonish, or censure, the member complained of.

If compulsory membership were brought about, it would, of course, involve the payment of a membership subscription, so increasing the income of the Society and throwing the expense of the work which the Council now do, with the support only of those who are members of the Society, upon the profession at large.

The idea that the income of the Society would thus be increased, and that the profession as a whole would contribute to that increase, is certainly attractive, but the main question, it seems to me, is not one of income, but rather, whether any considerable advantage would accrue to the profession, by changing the constitution of the Society from its present voluntary nature to one of a compulsory character. The arguments, which I need not further particularise here, for and against the proposal, were submitted to the Provincial Law Societies, and their replies were of such a doubtful character that the Council decided that there was no such demand for the change as would justify them in promoting the necessary legislation, a decision with which I cordially agreed. I have heard it frequently asserted that a voluntary army is better than a conscripted one, and the same may be said of any body of men.

At the same time, and in common with all my colleagues on the Council, I feel very strongly that every member of the profession ought to be a member of the Society, both from the point of view of his duty, and also of his personal interest. I put duty first as I would rather make an appeal to my fellow Solicitors on the higher ground, as in my experience we, as a body, do not, when made conscious of it, shirk our duty, as was abundantly shown by the profession during the late war.

It is the paramount duty of every Solicitor to increase by all the means in his power the prestige of the profession and I maintain that this can best be done by supporting the Law Society, to whom has been committed by its Charters, and also by the Legislature, the government and oversight of the profession. It is obviously unfair that the carrying out of these duties should be borne only by a section, however important and representative it may be of the profession at large, to say nothing of throwing upon that section the necessary cost thereby incurred, all of which is now defrayed by the members of the Society alone.

Another obvious result would be that, if the Council could speak as the mouthpiece of practically the whole profession, its influence, great as it is at present, would be still greater, and more beneficial to all concerned.

With regard to the point of individual interest, I would observe that membership of the Society tends to promote a stronger and more intimate feeling of fellowship between the individual Solicitor and his professional brethren throughout the country, and moreover gives him a recognised position in the eyes of the public, which is of itself a great benefit to him in his professional career. Furthermore the Law Society provides for its members a magnificent library and also the amenities of a first-rate Social Club with its Hall (fully supplied with newspapers, etc.), common room, dining, refreshment and smoking rooms, and all for the modest subscription of three guineas for town members and half that sum for country members. There is no Club in England which provides its members with so many advantages for such a paltry sum, as does the Law Society, and I feel sure that if all these matters were really taken into careful consideration our membership would be increased by many thousands.

The Committee to which I have referred is still sitting charged with the duty of exploring the best means by which our membership can be increased without destroying the character of the Society as a voluntary association, but I should like to see the labours of that Committee happily ended by a very large and immediate increase in our membership. In the meantime the Committee will gladly receive and give their best consideration to any suggestions that any member may think proper to send them upon the subject.

In conclusion it gives me much pleasure to add that notwithstanding the losses suffered by the profession during the war, the membership of the Society is higher to-day than it has ever been, and considerably in excess of what it was in 1913.

Mr. F. BEDWELL (President of the Scarborough Law Society) moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Botterell, observing that he agreed heartily in his remarks on the proposal for a Ministry of Justice. The profession was far better off in the hands of the Lord Chancellor, who was always an eminent lawyer, as the President had pointed out. If a Minister of Justice were appointed, no doubt—following the example of previous appointments—his chief qualification would be that he should possess entire ignorance of the subjects with which he would have to deal. The present was a very

human Lord Chancellor. As to clerks, he thought they were all agreed that good feeling should be fostered between employer and employed, but that certainly the division between the clerk and the solicitor should not be got rid of, and that the qualifications for entry into the profession should, if anything, be raised. By that means only could the best interests of the profession be served.

Mr. S. S. SEAL (London) said he agreed entirely with the President in the opinion that the suggestion for a Ministry of Justice was not tenable. It would have thrown upon it the duty of appointing the members of the judicial bench, a matter of the very greatest importance. Even under the present system, many of the appointments which were made were very much regretted by the profession. The effective method would be that there should be some competent authority or power which should delegate to it this responsibility. He thought there could be nothing more pernicious and foolish than to depute it to a Minister of Justice, who would probably have no qualification whatever for the work.

On the motion of Mr. BEDWELL a vote of thanks to the President for his address was carried with acclamation.

NEXT YEAR'S MEETING.

The SECRETARY (Mr. E. R. Cook) read a letter from the Hon. Secretary of the Leeds Law Society, inviting the Society to hold their provincial meeting next year at Leeds.

The PRESIDENT said that the invitation would be brought before the Council, when it, no doubt, would be accepted.

SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION.

Mr. R. C. NESBITT (London) read a paper on this subject, in the course of which, after referring to the statutes of 1729 and 1840, he said:—

Suggested legislation was before the House of Lords between 1843 and 1870, and I find that on the 10th March, 1865, the Lord Chancellor referred to the anomaly under which any man employing a surveyor, architect or engineer was enabled to enter into a contract with him as to the remuneration which he should receive, while the solicitor and client were debarred from making any such contract. He stated that the then present mode of remuneration was productive of injury to both parties, as the longer the time employed in performing the business, the greater would be the solicitor's remuneration. He added that if some power could be placed in the hands of solicitors whereby they would be authorised to enter into arrangements with their clients, they might be safely trusted to devise some mode of remuneration which would not only give them a fair return for their skill and time, but would enable them to act in a spirit more satisfactory to their clients, and he added that such an arrangement would tend to the advantage not only of the clients but also of the profession itself, for he knew nothing that had done more harm to the profession of the law as a science than the objectionable manner in which attorneys had been remunerated.

The anomaly is forcibly commented on in a small volume of letters written in 1857 by Mr. Joshua Williams, the eminent conveyancer, in which I find he puts the question of costs in the forefront of his argument on lawyers and law reform and says:—

"When you want a house built or repaired, you employ a builder, and make the best contract with him that you can, but with all your foresight, there are sure to be many little items left unprovided for, and the matter can be settled by a jury, but with your lawyer it is otherwise. You trust him with your family secrets, with matters which, if divulged, might injure your reputation or ruin your credit—you expect him to stand by you, to think for you, to take that most disagreeable thing, trouble, off your hands, and you know by experience that rarely indeed is such a trust betrayed, and yet, when you come to pay him for matters like these (which in their nature cannot be twisted on a reel or turned into a pint pot) the only question you ask him is how many words he has written in your service. Try if you can to imagine anything more preposterous. You know enough of mankind to see that to pay by length must of necessity breed prolixity. Trust your lawyer to send in a reasonable bill, and if he overcharges, let twelve honest men of the jury, after hearing both sides, decide between you. Abolish altogether the taxation of costs, and you will have taken one great step towards strengthening the confidence which ought to exist between a man and his professional adviser, and towards improving and elevating the profession of the law."

As a result of the discussions in the Lords came the Solicitors Act, passed on the 14th April, 1870, which provided that a solicitor might make an agreement in writing with his client respecting the amount and manner of payment for any past or future services in respect of business done or to be done by such solicitor either by a gross sum or by a commission or percentage or by salary or otherwise and either at the same or at a greater or lesser rate than the rate at which he would otherwise be entitled to be remunerated. This Act of 1870, which on the face of it seemed to go a long way in the right direction, has been very little used, the reason, I think, being that the profession consider that payment on a fair and reasonable scale ought to follow as a necessary consequence of his employment. It is, of course, very difficult, except in the case, say, of a journey to Paris or to New York or the arrangement of some financial transaction, to say in advance what is the proper sum to be paid. The solicitor either names too much or too little for what turns out has actually had to be done, and speaking generally the number of agreements entered into under the Act is negligible.

The Conveyancing Act of 1881 produced a complete alteration in the methods of conveyancing in this country, and was the cause, I think, of

the introduction of the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, 1881. That enlightened Lord Chancellor—Lord Chancellor Cairns—when dealing with the Bill of 1881, stated that the remuneration of solicitors in conveyancing matters depended, strange to say, very much on the length of those instruments. "It was as if physicians were remunerated according to the quantity of medicine they could persuade their patients to take." He said that the only wonder was that so little evil had been produced by the system, and he must acknowledge that he had never seen on the part of solicitors anything but an earnest desire to save their clients all the expense they could, and not to benefit themselves from the state of the law as it existed. He did not think it fair to take away the length of instruments which fixed remuneration and provide nothing in its place. As a result of this Act of 1881 came the scales of remuneration in conveyancing matters under which we have all been brought up. The remuneration under Schedule I of the Act is now inadequate and should be revised after the lapse of the forty years since it was fixed, and it was always inadequate, I think, in not providing for remuneration in the case of transactions which exceeded £100,000. With regard to Schedule II, it purports to be merely an alteration of the then existing system and was to continue subject to it. The schedule is open to the objection which is the basis of this paper. It is true that the schedule included a paragraph headed "Instructions for Drawing and Perusing Deeds, Wills and other Documents." With regard to "Instructions," the schedule provides for such fees as having regard to the care and labour required, the number and lengths of the papers to be perused and the other circumstances of the case may be fair and reasonable. Here, it was thought, was a clear instance of the absolute discretion conferred upon the Taxing Master as to the amount he will allow, and his discretion is dependent specifically, not upon the length of the documents which have to be prepared, but on the care and labour necessary in order completely to equip the solicitor for his task and the skill which the Taxing Master may consider he had devoted to it, but again matters have not worked in practice as was anticipated.

In 1919 it became apparent, owing to the general increase in the cost of living and owing to the increased salaries which solicitors had to pay to their clerks, that the remuneration which had hitherto prevailed was inadequate, and the question came before the Council as to how this situation could best be dealt with. Finally it was decided that a Special Order should be sought increasing the then existing charges under Schedule 2 with which everybody was familiar, by a fixed percentage, and a Special Order was made increasing the charges fixed by Schedule II by 33½ per cent.

THE ORDER OF JUNE 1920.

On 28th June, 1920, the Remuneration Committee under the Act of 1881 made an Order prescribing that the remuneration of a solicitor in respect of all business remuneration by Clause 2 (c) of the Order, that is to say, business, the remuneration for which was to be calculated under the Second Schedule, may, at the option of the solicitor, be by a gross sum in lieu of by detailed charges, and a proviso was inserted in the Order that a client might require that a detailed bill of charges should be delivered, and the solicitor should thereupon comply with the request, and any bill so delivered should be subject to taxation as if the provisions of this Order with respect to the regulations of remuneration by a gross sum had not been made. The rule-making authority thought that while they could authorise the delivery of a lump sum bill it must be a sum which could be justified by the delivery of an itemised bill the items of which would also be fixed, and while they were in favour of lump sum fees they thought that the basis of taxation must be altered if it were to be altered by Act of Parliament. The effect of the proviso to the Order of the 28th June, 1920, was simply to turn the solicitor back on the items prescribed by the Second Schedule, because unless the lump sum charged could be justified by items under that Schedule, the bill would be reduced on taxation to the dimensions of those items.

NATURE OF LEGISLATION DESIRED.

What is it that the profession now desire in order to put their remuneration on a footing which is more comparable with the dignity and standing of a learned profession in these times, which attracts to its ranks some of the ablest men in the country? I think we want to put into practice and properly legalise the principles which have been so admirably stated by eminent persons, judges and otherwise, in the House of Lords and out of it, during the past 100 years, the quotations of whose views I have ventured to lay before you. Unless some alteration is made there are those who fear not only that we may not continue to get the right kind of man into the profession, but that being there we may lose them for other callings where remuneration is higher and more readily fixed and where responsibility is less. Indeed, I can name four men of outstanding eminence in our profession who within the last year or so have abandoned the law for positions in the banking, commercial and financial worlds. I think that the point of view of the profession is that the established scale of charges with which we are familiar is unfortunate. To be paid in part for your skill by the profit you can make out of the number of documents is not only absurd, but it also is liable to expose the profession to distrust and ridicule. I recognise that the remuneration of the professional man depends to a very large extent on the amount of time he gives to the work, but the number of interviews he has with his client and others is an unsatisfactory method of estimating that item, and to judge of his skill by the length of the document he draws is ridiculous, while it is still more ridiculous to judge that skill by the length of the documents he has copied. In truth it is an attempt to compensate work which is abstract and therefore not readily assessable to money value by overweighting the value of work which is concrete and is so assessable.

I now want to make some observations based upon practical experience, elaborating to some extent some of the points I have been endeavouring to put before you. I should like to make a general observation with regard to the business transacted by the majority of solicitors. A very small fraction of it, except in the case of firms who specialise in litigation, ever comes to the notice of the Courts at all, and I should further say that the number of bills of costs which are taxed as between solicitor and client arising out of the transaction of the ordinary business of a solicitor is very small indeed. The bulk of the costs which are taxed are for the purpose of ascertaining what is to be paid by the unsuccessful party as a result of litigation. Another class of costs which require to be taxed are those which are payable out of a fund in Court, and many of these, so far as administration suits are concerned, are on the footing of solicitor and client charges, and where Trustees are concerned on the footing of costs, charges and expenses in addition. There remain, then, the costs outside those just mentioned, in which a difference of opinion arises between a solicitor and his client as a result of which proceedings for taxation are taken under the Solicitors Act. These are not numerous, and I shall be within the mark if I say they do not number more than 200 or 300 a year on the average. The figures to be precise of orders made under the Statute in 1912 were 386 and in 1920 they were 126. Orders of all classes were in the same years 8,596 and 7,217 respectively. There are nearly 15,000 solicitors in England and Wales, and the number of transactions is, of course, very large indeed. The number of bills of costs delivered by the profession cannot, in the opinion of those competent to judge, be less than 600,000 a year, and I emphasise these figures as showing how small is the proportion of bills and disputes which the parties are unable themselves to adjust. Under the system of remuneration I am advocating I do not anticipate the proportion would increase.

With regard in particular to the proceedings under the Solicitors Act the taxation is at present unsatisfactory in very many cases. I would myself say that it is unsatisfactory so far as the procedure in arriving at the amount is concerned in every case, but so far as the result of the taxation is concerned there are undoubtedly many cases where the result is perfectly fair and not unsatisfactory to the solicitor. By saying that in almost every case the procedure of arriving at the amount to be paid to the solicitor is unsatisfactory, I mean that no system which is going to overweight the concrete by taking into account a fee for the services of the office boy in sending a telegram or a fee for acknowledging a letter (I give these as illustrations) can properly be regarded as a satisfactory system; while, speaking generally, no fee at all is allowed to the solicitor for skill, labour responsibility or experience or any attention paid to the amount involved in the transaction. No system which judges almost entirely by the number of letters written and the number and length of documents prepared or perused is satisfactory. It will be generally acknowledged that in the majority of cases the skill of the practitioner manifests itself in attaining the end in view by a minimum of correspondence and documents, and it is for the exercise of this skill, i.e., the abstract work, that at present he is unremunerated. Professional practice in this matter has been in advance of the law and the method by which solicitors to an increasing extent and with the approval of the Council of the Law Society deliver their bills to their clients is that a short summarised statement of the work done—say from four or five lines to five and twenty, according to the volume of the work—is delivered and an inclusive fee for the work done is placed opposite the particulars contained in this statement; below this are given particulars of the disbursements which the solicitor has made for Counsel's fees, stamp duty, travelling expenses and the like. At the foot of the statement are usually contained the words "Details if desired." In arriving at the fee to be charged, the details of the work are all looked at, and, in fact, according to my experience, the items in the draft bill are all priced and added up and probably in nine ordinary cases out of ten, the total of these items tallies within a guinea or two one way or the other with the amount of the fee charged. In the other cases where the item charges would either show too large a sum, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the ability of the client to pay, or where they would be far too little for the skill, labour, responsibility and amount of work involved in the business, then a fee disproportionate to the item charges is delivered.

The legislation which the Council of the Law Society desire, is that in every case, and not only in cases which come under the Order of the 28th June, 1920, it should be open to the solicitor to deliver at his option a lump sum bill in lieu of remuneration, either by an *ad valorem* scale, or by fixed or detailed charges. If the amount is called in question then the Tribunal (in the case of our profession, the Taxing Master) would be, as in the case of any other dispute with regard to remuneration, at liberty to call for all the details of the work done, and to see the papers in the matter. It is suggested that with what I will call the "draft bill" before him showing the work done and the papers he should then arrive at the proper sum to be paid to the solicitor, having regard to the skill, labour, special exertion and responsibility involved in the business; the amount of the money or the value of the property or subject-matter to which the business or work relates; the place, district, circumstances and despatch at or in or with which the business is transacted, and the number and importance of the documents prepared or perused without regard to length. It is submitted that with these materials and taking into account these considerations, the Taxing Master is well able to arrive at the sum which should be paid to the solicitor. He is, of course, far better able than a jury would be to arrive at the figure, because he has had vast experience of the matters with which he is dealing. I think further that the Taxing Master should be at liberty, and should in fact take into account, the professional experience of the solicitor concerned. I realise that age and experience are factors

which it is difficult to gauge with accuracy, but speaking generally it seems absurd that a solicitor in the prime of life, in large practice and at the head of his profession should only be entitled to be remunerated, in the case of dispute with his client at the same rate as the latest recruit to the roll. It may, of course, well be that some young solicitor, admitted but a few years, may have more skill, energy and capacity than a man who has toiled at his profession for 30 or 40 years, but I think the Committee will, while appreciating that there are difficulties in application, realise that the principle, which is certainly to be found applicable in the other liberal professions, is one which it is not unfair should be applied in fixing the remuneration of members of the solicitors' profession.

I recognise there are practical difficulties in applying the above principle because sometimes taxations are heavy matters and a great deal of the detail work of going through the bill of costs which is to be taxed is, of necessity, not done by the Taxing Master himself but is admirably done by his staff who, however, do not look much beyond the stereotyped priced items amongst which they have been brought up. It could not well be otherwise because many of them have not seen—or have not seen for many years—the actual working of a solicitor's office and have not the requisite elasticity of mind. The Taxing Master himself is well able to fix the final amount when the work of checking details and the like has been done in his office if he takes into consideration the factors I have already enumerated. I think therefore that the position should be regularised by statute so far as delivering statements with the fee attached to them in lieu of the old-fashioned detailed bills of costs and I think a step in the right direction would have been taken if this were done. It is putting a modern interpretation on Section 37 of the Act of 1843. I further think that in cases where the amount of the bill is in dispute the Taxing Master with, as I have said, all the documents in the case and the entries which go to make up the draft bill before him, could well arrive at the sum which should be paid.

In this connection I should like to mention that in substance the only lump sum of moment with which the profession and the Taxing Masters are alike acquainted is the item in litigation bills called "Instructions for Brief." It sets out substantially the work that was done in connection with the preparation of the Brief; it makes no separate charges for interviews with witnesses or correspondence with them or with the client or for journeys taken or for any of the matters which go to make up the item "Instructions for Brief," but a Taxing Master with the Brief and accompanying papers before him and a record of the work done is generally able with satisfaction to the profession to fix a lump sum for this item. It may be five guineas or it may be 200 or 300 guineas and in very special cases no doubt a larger sum than that. In order to arrive at this figure the Taxing Master has certainly had to take into account to some extent skill, labour, expedition, responsibility and the amount involved but has not taken into account—or has taken into account in a very small degree—what the actual itemised charges would amount to. It seems to me that this principle of arriving at a fee for Instructions for Brief could well be applied to the remuneration of solicitors generally in all matters. I do not think the Taxing Masters would find it difficult to extend the practice with which, in respect of the item I have already mentioned, they are so well familiar.

After referring to the practice in other countries, Mr. Nesbitt continued:—

SAFEGUARDS FOR CLIENTS.

The last matter—and the Council of the Law Society are fully alive to its importance—is that there should be protection to the client against overcharges and opportunity for having every bill in which a dispute arises reviewed. Any safeguards which can be introduced to give effect to this position should be introduced, but in my judgment the protection accorded to the client by the present draft bill is sufficient for the purpose. The rights of third parties to question bills that have been delivered or paid should also remain as at present. There must inevitably be some few cases in which overcharges are made by solicitors as they are made by persons in all other callings, and it is recognised that whatever the basis and method of remuneration may be such cases will occur. Under the present system, however, it is clear that an unscrupulous practitioner does in fact obtain advantage merely by multiplying documents and correspondence.

Something has been said during the discussions on the bill as to the records of work done which are kept by solicitors. I can speak with some knowledge of the views of the Council of the Law Society on this subject; we have all been brought up to keep careful records of all work done in our offices, and the Council regard the continuation of that practice as most important, not so much from the point of view of the making out of a bill of costs, but because it is highly advisable that records made at the time should be available for reference, and such records give a clear consecutive history of the whole transaction. I do not think the proposed legislation would lead to the abandonment of this excellent habit, and I do not doubt that if it were thought advisable the Council would at the right time put out a statement to the profession to the effect that the practice of keeping records as at present should be continued; naturally there are cases in the experience of most of us which are of such a character that no records are kept and no correspondence takes place, but these are exceptional.

In conclusion, I trust that the interest and importance of this matter may be held to justify me in calling attention to it, and I entertain the hope that legislation upon the lines anticipated may commend itself to the sense of this meeting.

Mr. C. L. NORDON (London) thought that the reason why the reform in question had not been brought about was that the members of the Council had reached a position of eminence where such matters did not trouble them. At present no remuneration was given for mental work,

but simply for length of documents. Solicitors had to employ large staffs and under the present system they could not adequately remunerate them. The solicitors' managing clerk was a splendid fellow; but the solicitor being allowed only a paltry 6s. 8d. or 3s. 4d. for the clerk's labour, he could not earn the salary he was paid.

Mr. J. H. COOKE (Winsford, Cheshire) urged that solicitors should send in their bills to clients, charging a lump sum. He himself did so, and had delivered such bills for as high as £370 in one case, and he found that they were readily paid, and that the practice was satisfactory to the client. He suggested that the members of the Society should add to their names on their letter paper, and so on, the words "Associate of The Law Society." This would go a long way with the client and would add to the membership of the Society. He thought also that a solicitor should be entitled to increased remuneration according to the number of years he had been in practice. (*Laughter and Oh!*) Was it not perfectly absurd that he, who had been in practice fifty years, should only be entitled to make the same charges as the man who had been in practice only five months? The work of the profession required experience and diplomacy, which could only be acquired by years of study, intelligence and experience. He suggested that the Council should send out a circular recommending the members to add the words he had mentioned to their names. He thought also that the question of the remuneration of the judges should be considered. Their salaries at present, after the income tax had been deducted, were not worth having.

Dr. JACKSON (Hull, a member of the Council) observed that the remuneration of the solicitor compared very unfavourably with that of those in commercial employment. Why was it that people in other callings who were half his age and had but quarter of his experience were earning two or three times as much as he could? If the standard of the profession was to be maintained the remuneration must be equivalent to that which ruled in other callings. He agreed with Mr. Cooke that the failing was largely due to solicitors themselves in not asserting themselves as he had suggested. If a solicitor could be trusted with a man's business of the most vital importance, surely the client could trust him to make out a lump sum bill of costs.

Mr. F. NUNN (Colwyn Bay) said that many solicitors who would like to follow Mr. Cooke's advice were not able to do so. He thought the scale of costs was too high where the solicitor acted both for vendor and solicitor. He also considered that completions through bankers ought to be severely deprecated—the profession lost something like a quarter of a million a year from this practice. Again, there should be some such discipline as that which prevailed among the members of the Stock Exchange, and it should be deemed unprofessional for a solicitor to charge less than the scale permitted.

Mr. D. L. POWELL (Bridgend) agreed with the last speaker. A great trouble in South Wales was that there were solicitors who were utterly incompetent to carry on the work of a solicitor as it should be done, who made it a practice to undercut those of a higher standing, and clients went from solicitor to solicitor to find out who would do their work most cheaply. The Law Society of his district had taken action in the matter and had agreed upon a minimum scale which the solicitors had accepted, but it was thought that it was not adhered to always. He did not agree that the older a solicitor grew the wiser he became. (*Laughter and Oh!*) Many became less competent as the years went by.

Mr. W. SCOTT (Cardiff), who observed that he was secretary of the local Law Society in 1912 when the Provincial Meeting was held at Cardiff, differed most emphatically from the remarks of the last two speakers. He was well acquainted with a large number of solicitors in South Wales and a few in North Wales. The profession in South Wales, at all events, was equal in high integrity to the profession throughout the country.

Mr. NUNN said he had not meant his remarks to apply to the practitioners generally, but to the exceptions who lowered the character of the profession.

Mr. POWELL expressed himself to the same effect.

Mr. E. A. BELL (London) advocated strongly that solicitors should be remunerated for the value of their work and not according to the length of their bills. He moved "That this meeting approves of the suggestion for the assessment of solicitors' remuneration, in Mr. Nesbitt's paper, and the action of the Council in support of the Bill now before the Lord Chancellor's Committee."

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the motion was not seconded, though he understood that Mr. Bell approved of the action taken by the Council in introducing the Bill.

SOLICITOR AND CLERK.

Mr. REGINALD ARMSTRONG (President, Leeds Law Society) read a paper with this title, in which he spoke of the changes which had taken place in the qualifications and position of law clerks during the last 30 years. The main problems and principles were (1) wages and (2) where were the skilled clerks of the next generation to be found? With regard to the wages, he asserted that in any case there could be no great increase, because it was a reasonable contention that no solicitor would be long content to make a loss, or only a small and precarious profit. The two last years had been prosperous for most solicitors, and it had been possible to pay high wages, but the time would surely come when profits would be more difficult to earn. After all, many solicitors, in common with many clerks, could change their profession for some other if prompted by improved financial prospects. If high wages were to continue there must be increased efficiency on the part of the clerks. He was not in favour of standardisation or outside negotiation. If a solicitor and his clerk, living and working together, could not settle

their wages and conditions of work, an outside body of busy-bodies from other offices could not mend matters. When it was asked that tests and standards should be lowered to enable clerks to enter the profession as solicitors, he entirely disagreed. This would be lowering the standard and status of the solicitors to better that of the clerks. Further, if any large number of men were admitted on a lower financial, social and educational basis it would surely mean ruinous competition for all the lower paid, smaller and casual work done by the profession, out of which many must subsist during their earlier admitted years, however they might enter the profession. He was firmly convinced that financial standing in the profession was a recommendation. Solicitors were entrusted with the handling of their clients' material affairs, and the clients were in many cases obliged to repose absolute confidence in the solicitor, and a sound financial position was a very good backing, in the public interests, of such confidence. What was really necessary between employer and clerk was a spirit of co-operation and a real desire to make the best joint product and share the resulting profit equitably. He meant that the solicitors' cost of training, his responsibility, and his risk of non-success, must necessarily lead to the chance of greater financial reward than the security of the clerks' position could justify. Equality in this connection would not be equity.

Sir ROGER GREGORY (London, member of the Council) said he had worked as a clerk and had gone right through the mill and he had a great admiration for the solicitors' clerks. The profession owed a deep debt of gratitude to them. The relations between principal and clerk were somewhat peculiar and it would never do for any outside influence to come between them or to establish anything in the nature of a scale applicable to all degrees of clerks and all degrees of employers.

Mr. BARRY (Bristol, member of the Council), thought that in all properly constituted offices the clerk was probably adequately paid; but he was afraid there were a good many cases where that was not the case. He could not see why the clerks should not bargain collectively. He believed that in many towns this was done, and that it worked comparatively smoothly. He had a considerable amount of sympathy with the clerk. He believed that the Federation of Law Clerks was a very reasonable body and that its claims were not exorbitant. He did not see why solicitors should be afraid of their clerks joining anything of the kind, and thought that instead of increasing friction it would in some cases aid in the smoothness of working.

A MEMBER stated that at Preston a Conciliation Board had been formed which dealt with individual cases of solicitor and clerk, and that the result had been good. The Board had not agreed to a scale of minimum salaries.

Colonel MACLURE (Manchester) said that in his district a joint committee had been formed and a scale agreed on which appeared to be satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT suggested that members with small practices should give their opinion. It would be impossible for a man with a small practice to pay the minimum of £400 a year that was asked for a managing clerk.

Mr. SCRIVEN (member of the Council) said the Council had been fighting for the last two years against the introduction of the pernicious trade union system, as had solicitors all through the provinces. Every solicitor was capable of appreciating the real merit of a clerk, but to suggest that the least inefficient clerk should be paid a salary equal to that of the best was a principle to which they all objected. Each case must be dealt with individually. If the federation was to be recognised it could only be to the extent of particular cases for particular localities. A good wage in one part might be a very small one somewhere else.

The PRESIDENT said that he was the chairman of the Joint Conciliation Board for London. He was quite prepared to accept a minimum scale considerably lower than that put forward by the clerks. One difficulty was to define the meaning of managing clerk. There was a very good Managing Clerks' Association in existence and they were very keen on keeping up the standard of the managing clerk. If one could get a good definition of "managing clerk" he did not see that there was much objection to grading and a reasonable minimum salary being fixed.

The discussion was continued at considerable length, the opinion generally expressed being that anything like trade unionism was undesirable and that it could not be expected that solicitors with small practices should pay £400 a year to their clerks.

OVERDUE REFORMS IN PROCEDURE.

Mr. JAMES J. DODD (London) read a paper which we hope to notice hereafter.

RENT RESTRICTION 1920-1921.

Mr. E. A. ALEXANDER (London) read a paper which also we hope to notice hereafter.

(Adjourned to Wednesday.)

BANQUET.

A dinner was held in the evening at the Grand Hotel, at which Mr. BEDWELL presided. Among the guests were Sir Claud Schuster, Mr. H. B. Grotrian (Recorder of Leeds) and His Hon. Judge Fossett Lock. The PRESIDENT proposed the health of the Lord Chancellor, observing that Lord Birkenhead was one of the most able men the country had ever had. He had been a good friend to the solicitor branch of the profession. Sir CLAUD SCHUSTER, in replying on behalf of Lord Birkenhead, said that the proposed Ministry of Justice seemed to involve the removal from the Lord Chancellor of the superintendence of the law with respect to procedure in the courts and the administration of the

courts themselves, as well as the patronage of the great offices of the courts. It might be well for the society to consider whether it would not be best that reforms in procedure and the machinery thereof should rest with a great officer such as the Lord Chancellor, who was himself trained in the practice of the law, and whether a person so close to the law itself, occupying the position of a judge, was not in a better position to exercise patronage than one who might be inclined to look rather to the interests of any Government which might be in power than to the best interests of administration. Mr. CORSON PEAKE (Leeds) gave the toast of "The Judiciary." His Hon. Judge FOSSETT LOCK, and Mr. H. B. GROTRIAN, Recorder of Leeds, responding. The CHAIRMAN proposed the health of the President, Mr. BOTTERELL returning thanks.

RECEPTION.

Mrs. Botterell gave a reception to the ladies accompanying the members at the Grand Hotel, nearly one hundred accepting her invitation. A programme of vocal and instrumental music was given.

Wednesday's Proceedings.

THE RULES OF ENGLISH LAW APPLICABLE TO COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

Mr. E. LESLIE BURNIN, LL.D. (London) read a paper on this subject which we hope to notice hereafter.

THE REFORM OF THE LEASEHOLD SYSTEM.

Mr. SAMUEL SAW (Greenwich, a member of the Council) read a paper which also we hope to notice hereafter.

The SECRETARY (Mr. E. R. Cook) pointed out that the Law of Property Bill contains a clause giving power of relief to lessors for the breach of a covenant against assignment or underletting without consent, and that it also contains provisions for converting perpetually renewable leases and underleases into long terms, and for preventing the creation of perpetually renewable leases and leases on lives.

A discussion took place in which Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. WILLIAMS (Brixham), Mr. RYLANDS (Manchester), Mr. W. GIBSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne), Mr. BRAMWELL (Preston), Mr. F. H. STAPLEY (Eastbourne), Mr. BARRY (Bristol), Mr. CLAY (Sheffield) and others took part, instances being given of the oppressive action of the present leasehold system, though some of the speakers referred to its advantages in certain cases. Mr. R. W. DIBDIN (London, member of the Council), considered that, putting all things together, there was a very great deal of advantage connected with leasehold tenure, some of which he thought had escaped the reader of the paper.

Mr. SAW, in replying, said that his paper did not propose the abolition of leaseholds but the reform of the system. The suggestion he had made was that leaseholds should be automatically increased on the proper terms to a period of 999 years.

The PRESIDENT said that the matter was, of course, to be considered from two points of view, that of the landlords and that of the tenants. A bargain, after all, was a bargain.

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION AND THE COMMERCIAL COURT.

Dr. A. M. JACKSON (Hull, member of the Council), read a paper which we hope to notice hereafter.

The PRESIDENT said the value of the Commercial Court was that it only tried commercial cases and the way was not blocked with any other kind of case. Anything of that kind which tended to facilitate the trial of cases, he agreed with Mr. Jackson, was very valuable. One great advantage of the arbitrations was that they got rid of the expert witnesses. There were two commercial arbitrators and an umpire who were all in the trade with which the dispute was concerned. They knew the rules of the trade and they dare not find against what was the custom of the trade. To that, extent arbitrations were extraordinarily useful, and if a litigant in arbitration asked for a special case on a point of law it often happened that, when the subject was considered by solicitor and counsel, it was found to be not a point of law but a question of the custom of the trade, the notice was withdrawn and the arbitrator's award was accepted.

THE GENTLE ART OF FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION.

Mr. E. A. BELL (London) read a paper on this subject which we hope to notice hereafter.

Votes of thanks were passed to the Scarborough Law Society, to the Whitby Law Society and to the readers of papers and to others who had assisted in making the visit of the Law Society a success.

EXCURSIONS, ETC.

On Thursday there was a char-a-banc excursion to Whitby, the visitors being entertained at afternoon tea at the Royal Hotel, by invitation of the Whitby Law Society. In the evening a special concert was given at the Spa, Scarborough, by the Spa orchestra and eminent artists. Reserved seats were placed at the disposal of the visitors. Members were admitted to the honorary membership of various clubs during the visit, arrangements were made for golf and lawn tennis, and other entertainments were provided.

Solicitors' Benevolent Fund.

The annual meeting of this association was held at the Grand Hotel, Scarborough, on Wednesday, Mr. T. S. CURTIS (Chairman of the Board) presiding. The Report of the Directors stated that the Association has now 3,757 members, of whom 1,108 are Life and 2,649 Annual Subscribers.

During the year 88 subscribers had been lost through death and 3-6 through withdrawals, and there were 173 new subscribers. The sum of £655 received during the year from Life Subscriptions was considerably in excess of any sum previously received. The following legacies had been received: £100 under the will of the late Mr. A. M. Phillips; £100 under the will of the late Mr. G. D. Malins; and £50 under the Will of the late Mr. F. C. Greenfield. The income of the General Fund amounted to £8,113 15s. 10d. and from the Trust Funds £1,509 11s. 2d. The total relief granted was £7,858 5s., which included 203 grants from the General Fund, on account of which £5,822 5s. had been paid, namely: £2,156 to members and families of members, and £3,666 5s. to non-members and families of non-members, and the balance was devoted to annuities under the various pension funds. The total amount given to members' cases was £3,509 and to non-members £4,349 5s. The Report was unanimously adopted on the motion of the Chairman, and votes of thanks were passed to the Board of Directors and others.

Incorporated Accountants.

The next examinations of candidates for admission into the Society of Incorporated Accountants and Auditors will be held on 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th November.

Women are eligible under the Society's regulations to qualify as incorporated accountants upon the same terms and conditions as are applicable to men.

The Westminster City Council and Building

That the Westminster City Council have given notice to their lessees, Messrs. Goddard & Smith, the well-known auctioneers, of the Vestry Hall, 196, Piccadilly, determining the lease at Christmas next, because of the Council's intention to rebuild this important property, is of particular relevance in these days of restricted new building operations. The site is extensive and valuable, and it will be interesting especially to the ratepayers to learn what particular class of new building is to be put upon it.

Messrs. Goddard & Smith have purchased the freehold of 22, King-street, St. James', S.W.1, and the extensive alterations and additions, including the erection of an auction hall, will be completed to enable the firm to remove to their new quarters at the end of November.

Law Students' Journal.

Law Students Debating Society.

At a meeting of the Society held at the Law Society's Hall, on Tuesday, 4th October, 1921 (Chairman, Mr. C. W. Bower), the subject for debate was, "That in the opinion of this House the present Government does not deserve the confidence of the country." Mr. D. E. Oliver opened in the affirmative. Mr. W. S. Jones opened in the negative. The following members also spoke: Messrs. H. M. Bowden, J. F. Chadwick, H. Glyn Jones, Peter Anderson, H. S. Heath, D. Nimmo, and W. M. Pleadwell. The motion was lost by one vote. There were sixteen members and one visitor present.

Obituary.

Mr. E. A. Wurtzburg.

Mr. Edward Albert Wurtzburg, barrister-at-law, died of heart failure on 27th September while on a visit to his son at Singapore, aged 70. The son of Edward Wurtzburg, merchant, of Scarborough, he graduated at the University of London, and was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1873. He was joint editor of the sixth edition of Morgan's "Chancery Acts and Orders," and of the second edition of Morgan's "Costs in Chancery," and was the author of the standard work on the Law of Building Societies, a subject on which he was a well-known authority. He had many friends at Lincoln's Inn, where the news of his death has been received with great regret.

Legal News.

Business Announcement.

Messrs. JENKINS, BAKER & Co., and CLEMENTS, WILLIAMS & Co., of 3, London Wall-buildings, London, E.C.2, have admitted into partnership Mr. GEORGE BYRON WINSON, who has been in charge of one of their departments for some time past. The name of the firm will remain as heretofore.

CORPORATE TRUSTEE & EXECUTOR.

THE ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE

ACTS AS

TRUSTEE of FUNDS amounting to

£30,000,000.

For Particulars apply to:

THE SECRETARY, HEAD OFFICE, ROYAL EXCHANGE, E.C.3.
THE MANAGER, LAW COURTS BRANCH, 29-30, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.1.
THE TRUSTEE MANAGER, MANCHESTER BRANCH, 94-96, KING STREET.

Appointments.

Mr. T. HOWARD DEIGHTON, solicitor, has been appointed by Mr. Sheriff G. Mills McKay as his Under-Sheriff for the City of London during 1921-22.

Mr. EDGAR MEYNELL has been appointed to be Recorder of Doncaster in the place of Mr. Samuel Fleming, who has been appointed a metropolitan police magistrate. Mr. Meynell, who was called to the Bar by the Middle Temple in 1884, practises on the North-Eastern circuit, and at the Newcastle, Northumberland, and Durham sessions.

Dissolutions.

WILLIAM HAWKINS HERBERT and ARTHUR GRENVILLE HERBERT, Solicitors, 10, Cork-street, London, W.1 (W. H. & A. G. Herbert), 29th day of September. [*Gazette*, October 4th.]

GEORGE HUGGINS and HUGH WILLIAMS, Solicitors, Union Chambers, 63, Temple-row, Birmingham (Huggins & Williams). The said George Huggins will continue to carry on the practice under the style of "Huggins & Co." [*Gazette*, October 4th.]

General.

Lord and Lady Reading were at Simla recently entertained at dinner by the two Punjab Ministers, Khan Bahadur Mian Fazl-i-Hussein and Lala Harkishon Lal. Replying to the toast of his health, the Viceroy said that he was not in the slightest inclined to lose the hope with which he came to India.

The new road sign-posts, designs of which have been standardized after much consideration, are making their appearance very slowly, and it is anticipated that it will be a long time before they come into general use. In view of the great demand for economy, it is proposed at present to introduce the new road direction posts and warning signs only when existing sign-posts require repair or replacement.

Sir William Edward Foster, F.S.A., of Lindum-house, Aldershot, and formerly of Moulton, Spalding, Lines., solicitor, a former President of the Hampshire Law Society, for some years a member of the Council of the Law Society, a writer on the history of Lincolnshire families and of the church in the county, Chairman of the Aldershot and District Traction Company, Limited, for some years Coroner for Aldershot, and clerk to the District Council, who died on 7th July, aged seventy-four, left estate of the gross value of £11,219, with net personality £10,372.

Mr. Lowther Bridger, in a letter to *The Times* of 25th September, writes:—It is quite time that we who use the highways of this country for walking, "by reason of preference or poverty," as "A Holiday Tramp" says in your columns, should not only join collectively in his protest against the general uglification of our country roads by widening, straightening, bevelling off corners, and all the other nostrums of the apostles of speed, but should also organize a strong resistance against our being almost driven off those roads, or our lives (and feet) being endangered and otherwise rendered miserable upon them, for the benefit of a pleasure traffic, which seeks to tear through the country in a kind of delirium, and is after all the mere selfish pastime of a comparatively limited section of the population.

We, οἱ πολλοί, have as much claim to the peaceful use and enjoyment of our roads as any of these hordes of pleasure-seekers who now continually rush through our midst. The right of the pedestrian to travel, path or no path, upon any part of the King's highway has always been acknowledged in law. This seems in danger of being lost sight of, but it is a right which the mass of the people who go on foot will not easily surrender, or allow to be infringed.

Professional men, and indeed all book lovers, should house their books in the "OXFORD" Sectional Bookcase, the best made, handsomest, and least expensive of all high grade sectional Bookcases. Illustrated catalogue gratis from sole Proprietors and Manufacturers, William Baker & Co., Ltd., Library Specialists, Oxford.—[ADVT.]

Court Papers.

THE COURT OF APPEAL. MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1921.

The Appeals or other business proposed to be taken will, from time to time, be announced in the Daily Cause List.

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION. (General List.)

1921.

Simplex Lithograph Co v Sir Joseph Causton & Sons ld
Hartley v The Scottish Metropolitan Assee Co ld
McLuskey & ors v Cole & ors
Higginson v Bentley & Bentley ld
Fry v Fry & ors
In re E A R Morris, dec Mayhew v Halton
In re G A Haig, dec Harris v Drayton & ors
The Consett Industrial & Provident Soc ld v The Consett Iron Co ld
In re Companies Winding Up In re H J Webb & Co (Smithfield, London) In re Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908
In re Sir Joseph Whitworth, Bart, dec O'Rourke v Darbishire
In re Viscount Astor, dec Astor v Adams & ors
Northbourne v Robert Johnston & Son
C Nettle & Co ld v Eugene ld
The Steam Saw Mills Co ld & ors v Baring Bros & Co ld
The Archangel Saw Mills Co v Baring Bros & Co ld
Chiswick Urban District Council v Driscoll
Macclesfield Corp v Governors, &c of the Free Grammar School of King Edward VI in Macclesfield
Same v Kinsey
Carvers ld v Bray & anr
In re an Arbtn between J W Garton & S R C Miller
In re Galsworthy, dec Galsworthy v Galsworthy
Rolph, Darwen & Pearce v Temperley & ors
Spottiswoode v Higginbottom
In re Beech's Settlement Beech v Public Trustee
Gray v Spyer
Tebbutt v Fless
Price v James
Jones v James & anr
Economic Building Corp ld v Liverpool Corp

FROM THE CHANCERY AND PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISIONS. (Interlocutory List.)

1921.

In re Hume-Gore, an infant Hume-Gore v Hume-Gore
White v Hooley & ors
Divorce Brailley, G A v Brailley, W H

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION. (In Bankruptcy.)

1921.

In re H W Wickham (expte H W Wickham v Chester Mayhew, Broome & Griffiths and The Official Receiver)
In re a Debtor (expte The Debtor v The Petitioning Creditor and The Official Receiver), No. 889 of 1921
In re a Debtor (expte The Debtor v The Petitioning Creditor and The Official Receiver), No. 588 of 1921
In re a Debtor (expte The Petitioning Creditor v The Debtor), No. 618 of 1921

FROM THE PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION. (Final and New Trial List.)

1921.

Probate In re H J Williams, dec Jillings v Bell & anr
Divorce Evans, A E v Evans, S M
Divorce Milnes, J V v Milnes, J G
Divorce Rutherford, A M M v Rutherford, N C (A E Richardson Intervener)
Divorce Vidal, E v Vidal, P V & Wilson
Divorce Peckham, M v Peckham, G R

FROM THE COUNTY PALATINE COURT OF LANCASTER. (Final List.)

1921.

In re J R N Jordison, dec Raine v Jordison
Baker v Hardman
(Interlocutory List.)
Gamble v Wright

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION. (Final and New Trial List.)

1920.

Hickman v The Royal Agricultural Soc of England (s.o. until after appl in House of Lords)
Morgan v Burt (s.o. gen. June 28)

1921.

Beswick v Dorman
Dugdale, Everton & Co ld v James Turner & Co (Manchester) ld
In re The Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1908 to 1914 In the Matter of an Arbitration between W S Ormonde (tenant) and J T Mills (Landlord) (remitted to Arbitrator to report, June 2)
Nitrate Producers Co v Short Bros ld (s.o. until after decision in House of Lords, May 30)
Attorney General v Manchester Ship Canal Co
Manchester Ship Canal Co v Brunner Mond & Co ld
D Smith & Sons v L Rothman & Co. (s.o. gen. June 29)
Harper Bean & Co ld v McFarlane
Same v McKeown
Same v Moodie
Same v McGugan
Attorney General v Bottomley
Larkin v Dixon (s.o. until after decision of House of Lords)
Same v Same
Attorney General v Bottomley
Same v Same
Smith v Wood & Rozelaar ld
Tatler v The British Motor Cab Co ld
Brown v Ladbroke & Co (s.o. until after decision in House of Lords)
The Hall Construction Co ld v Crowther & Osborn ld
Sumner, Permain & Co ld v John G Webb & Co ld
B Goodstein & Co v Gaunt
Brown v Bishop & anr
City Tailors ld v Evans
A L Underwood ld v Burgh Castle Brick & Cement Syndicate
Phillips & ors v Barnett
Prescott v Wilmae Produce & Manufacturing Co ld
Strauss & anr v Platt
William Denby & Sons v Waxman and anr

Esch v Wm Jacobs, Owen & Co
Brown v Swan (s.o. decision in House of Lords)
In re Agricultural Holdings Acts
In re an Arbitration between D Dale and Hatfield Chase Corp
Minerva Spinning Co ld v Baron Hume v Sizaire Berwick ld
Neilson v London & North Western Ry Co
D Smith & Sons v Kelly
Kelly v D Smith & Sons
Gruener v Morgan & ors
The Donside Paper Co ld v Colleys ld
French & anr v Gething
Sharp v Ekins Son & Percival ld
Sinclair v Powell
Payne v Hugh Baird & Sons ld
Weis v Entwistle
Thomas v March
Ginsburg v Craig
The Ariadne Steamship Co v James McKelvie & Co
In re an Arbtn between Suzuki & Co and Companhia Mercantil Internacional limitada
Pennington ld v Coupland
Edwards v the Metropolitan Water Board
McCabe v Cheshire Lines Committee
Gruener v Morgan & ors
S Rothstein & Sons v Imhof
Harrison v Holland & Hannan and Cubitts ld
North Western Cacher Tea Co ld v British and Benningtons ld
The Baintgoorie Tea Co ld v Same
Mazdohee Tea Co ld v Same
Potter v The Equitable Bank ld
De Meulemeester (Clmt) v Royal Commission on Wheat Supplies
Steel, Bradley & Co v Lloyds Bank ld
Diamond Alkali Export Corp (Sellers) v Bourgeois
Gruener v Morgan & ors
Bowler v Joseph Hoyle & Son
Brown v Craig & Pitcairn
Thomas Burnett & Co ld v Tremmer
The British Railway Traffic and Electric Co ld v Powell
Clay v Giles
Donald Stewart & Co ld v John Lofthouse & Co ld & ors
Clinton v Woodroffe & anr
Burton & Sons ld v W H Bowater ld
Blake v Chilvers
Shinman v Baker
Benabu & Co v Bruna Sampais & Co
Clay v Giles
Abrahams & anr v Herbert Reiaich ld
Societe des Hotels Touquet-Paris-Plage v Cummings
Walneff Bros v All Russian Co-operative Soc ld
Benabu & Co v Bruna, Sampais & Co
Blay v Dadsell
Holt & Moore v Liverpool & Central Oil Co ld
Gruener v Wilson & ors
Earle's Shipbuilding & Engineering Co ld v Aktieselskabet D/S Gefion & ors
Revenue Nevill v H.M. Comms. of Inland Revenue
Revenue Nevill & ors v Same
Basler, Spier & Co (Buyers) v Cantzlaar, Schalkwijk and Co
John Woyka & Co ld v London & Northern Trading Co ld
In re The Solicitors Acts 1843 & 1860
In re E. J. Ward
Baker v The Dalgleish Steam Shipping Co ld
Harris v Miller
Ambatielos v Grace Bros & Co ld
J Stewart & Son (1921) ld v Hudson
Harris v Thomas

Waghorn v Collison
Buxton v Simpson
In re an Arbitration between Laidro Poliakoff and Stromwall
Thomas Clarke & Son ld v E. Ascoli & Sons
Sringgeour v Christey
Russkoe Obschestvo D' Lia Izgostov. lenia Snariadov I'voennik Prip. assov v John Stirk & Sons ld
Coleman v Drughorn
Revenue Attorney General v Rt Hon Earl of Sandwich
Shashoua v Bradford Clothing and Manufacturing Co (Manchester) ld & Winston
Adamson v William Owen ld
Palmine ld v Grace Bros & Co ld
Rogers v Broadmeadow
Steer v Tate
H Backhouse & Co (Sheffield) ld v Gardner
Mann, George & Co ld v Brown
In the Matter of the Petition of Right of Robert Thomas Sutton
Hampson v Union of London & Smiths Bank ld
Tempest v Cohen
Collins & Wife v Laughter
Wells v Drop Stampings ld
The Rederiaktiebolaget "Amphitrite" v The Attorney General
Walker v The Herefordshire Fruit Co ld
In re an Arbtn between Suzuki & Co (Buyers) and Burgett & Newsam
In re an Arbtn between Burgett & Newsam (Buyers) and The United Baltic Corp ld
Cruise v Terrell
W H Keys ld v Hartland
In re Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908 In re an Arbtn between Judd (tenant) v McCreagh

FROM THE WAR COMPENSA- TION COURT.

In the Indemnity Act, 1920.

1921.

The Elliott Steam Tug Co ld v The Shipping Controller (remitted to Tribunal to report to C.A., July 28)
A & B Taxis ld v Secretary of State for Air (s.o. July 6)

FROM THE PROBATE DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (ADMIRALTY).

Judgments Reserved.

Heard before The Master of the Rolls, Atkin & Younger, L.JJ.
The Countess — 1921 — Folio 347
Hay v The Mersey Docks & Harbour Board & ors (c.a.v. July 12)
The Same — 1921 — Folio 348
Same v Same (c.a.v. July 12)

FROM THE PROBATE DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (ADMIRALTY).

With Nautical Assessors.

(Final List.)

1921.

Dalton — 1921 — Folio 8
Cory Lighterage ld v Owners of S.S. Dalton
Grampian — 1921 — Folio 71
Owners of S.S. Atherton v Owners of S.S. Grampian
Creterope — 1921 — Folio 6
Owners of Steam Tug Creterope v North Eastern Ry Co
Ran — 1921 — Folio 592
Owners of Barge Para v Owners of Barge Ran

Graygarth — 1920 — Folio 1,062
Rea ld v Owners of Barge Para
Trevoise — 1919 — Folio 855
Owners of S.S. Hollandschdiep v
Owners of S.S. Trevoise
Same v Same

Without Nautical Assessors.

(Final List.)

1921.

Tromp — 1920 — Folio 515
Jefferson v Gosling
Cornonaille — 1921 — Folio 245
Evans & Reid ld v Owners of S.S.
Cornonaille

(Interlocutory List.)

Joannis Vatis — 1917 — Folio 743
Owners of S.S. Worsley Hall v
Owners of Joannis Vatis

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

1921.

Osborne v Dawson
Curzon & anr v Surridge
Kokusai v Johnson
Lowe v Ramon de Asconio
Fenton Textile Assoc ld v Krassin
Osborne v Dawson
Niger Co ld v Guardian Assce Co ld
Nitrate Producers Steamship Co ld
v Short Bros ld
Glaskie v Bellencontre

IN RE THE WORKMEN'S COM- PENSATION ACTS, 1897 and 1906.

Judgment Reserved.

(From County Court.)

Heard before The Master of the
Rolls, Atkin & Younger, L.J.J.
Hunter v Simner (c.a.v. July 1)

IN RE THE WORKMEN'S COM- PENSATION ACTS, 1897 and 1906.

(From County Courts.)

1921.

Buckley v T E Marchington & Co
(Lancashire, Ashton-under-Lyne)
Joy v Morton (Surrey, Redhill)
Johnson v Bell Bros ld (Durham,
Durham)
Roberts v The Broughton & Plas
Power Colliery Co ld (Denbigh-
shire, Wrexham)
Rollings v Thompson (Worcester-
shire, Kidderminster)
Johnson v The Florence Coal & Iron
Co ld (Staffordshire, Stoke-upon-
Trent)
Milligan v Kerr, Stuart & Co ld
(Staffordshire, Hanley)
Jacobs v Mandelbaum (Middlesex,
Whitechapel)

N.B.—The above List contains Chancery, Palatine and King's Bench
Final and Interlocutory Appeals, etc., set down to 23rd September, 1921.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—CHANCERY DIVISION.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1921.

NOTICES RELATING TO THE CHANCERY CAUSE LIST.

Mr. Justice EVE.—Except when other business is advertised in the Daily
Cause List, Actions with Witnesses will be taken throughout the Sittings.

Mr. Justice SARGANT will take his business as announced in the Michaelmas
Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice ASTBURY will take his business as announced in the Michaelmas
Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice PETERSON will take his business as announced in the
Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Liverpool and Manchester Business.—Mr. Justice PETERSON will take
Lancashire business on Thursdays, the 20th October, the 3rd and 17th
November, and the 1st and 15th December.

Mr. Justice P. O. LAWRENCE.—Except when other business is advertised
in the Daily Cause List, Actions with Witnesses will be taken throughout
the Sittings.

Pritchard v The Votty & Bowydd
Slate Quarries Co ld (Carnar-
vonshire, Festiniog)
Pellett v Hove Corp'n (Sussex,
Brighton)

Watson v North Eastern Ry Co
(Northumberland, Blythe)
Morgan v Owners of ship "Speed-
well" & ors (Norfolk, Gt. Yar-
mouth)

Meador v Danum Steam Trawling
Co of Doncaster (Kent, Ramsgate)
Sabey & Sons v Bain (Middlesex,
Clerkenwell)

Metropolitan Carriage, Wagon &
Finance Co. ld v Young (Warwick-
shire, Birmingham)
Strudwick v Schweder (Sussex,
Worthing)

Hogg v Vickers ld (Lancashire,
Barrow-in-Furness)
Hopps v T Manners & Sons ld
(Durham, Bishop Auckland)

Brown v Kingsbury Collieries ld
(Staffordshire, Tamworth)
Standing in the "Abated" List.

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Final and New Trial List.)

1918.

Weiss, Biheller & Brooke ld (Applts)
v Richard Farmer, Surveyor of
Taxes (Receipt) (Revenue S de)
Selby-Lowndes v Selby-Lowndes
(s.o. generally—liberty to restore
by 14 days' notice on either side,
March 29, 1920)

1920.

The Elliot Steam Tug Co ld v John
Payne & Co (s.o. generally Dec.
15)

(Interlocutory List.)

1921.

Prenez v John Mercer & Sons (s.o.
generally—liberty to apply, April
5)

FROM THE PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(Final and New Trial List.)

1919.

Probate In re the Estate of Francis
Arthur Davies dec Davis, George
(Appl't) v Wills, Alfred & ors
(Receipt) (Appl't dead—s.o.)

IN RE THE WORKMEN'S COM- PENSATION ACTS, 1897 and 1906.

(From County Court.)

1921.

Martin v Lindsay's Paddington
Iron Works ld (s.o. generally
April 26)

Mr. Justice RUSSELL.—On each Friday afternoon Summonses under
Trading with the Enemy Act will be taken. Subject thereto Actions with
Witnesses will be heard throughout the Sittings.

Summonses before the Judge in Chambers.—Mr. Justice SARGANT will
hear Chamber Summonses on Tuesdays. Mr. Justice ASTBURY and
Mr. Justice PETERSON will sit in Court every Monday during the Sittings
to hear Chamber Summonses.

Summonses Adjourned into Court and Non-Witness Actions will be
heard by Mr. Justice SARGANT, Mr. Justice ASTBURY and Mr. Justice
PETERSON.

Motions, Petitions and Short Causes will be taken on the days stated in
the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS.
During the Michaelmas Sittings the Judges will sit for the disposal of
Witness Actions as follows:—

Mr. Justice EVE will take the Witness List for EVE and PETERSON, J.J.

Mr. Justice P. O. LAWRENCE will take the Witness List for ASTBURY
and P. O. LAWRENCE, J.J.

Mr. Justice RUSSELL will take the Witness List for SARGANT and RUSSELL,
J.J.

Chancery Causes for trial or hearing. Set down to 23rd September, 1921.

Before Mr. Justice EVE.

Retained Adjourned Summonses.
In re D'Oyly, dec Swayne v
D'Oyly
In re Thomas Lacy, dec Dyson v
Hirst
In re Mary Ann Lacy, dec Dyson v
Durrance
In re J J Johns, dec Geake v Johns
In re Kurtz's Settlement Trusts
Henderson v Layton
In re Thomas, dec Wright v
Wreford
In re Bushby's Contract In re
Vendor & Purchaser Act
In re Williams, dec Williams v
Williams

Causes for Trial.

(With Witnesses).

Mansell v Houston
Wylie v Carlyon
Hulley v Silversprings, &c. Co.
Arbib v Arbib
G A Harvey & Co (London) ld v
The United Glass Bottle Manfs ld.
Thompson v Thompson
Edwards v Pearson (s.o. for date
to be fixed)
Brown v Harris pt. hd. (s.o. October
18)
In re Baird, dec Whitelaw & ors v
Ginsburg & ors
Taylor v W & A Gilbey ld *
Leach v Briggs, Pollit & Co ld
J Chessum & Sons ld v Chessum &
anr (fixed October 19)
Kemp v James
Williamson v Inrig & Cutting (s.o.
until after inspection)
Curzon Bros ld v H A Roberts ld
Duché v Duché
Lines v G & J Lines ld
Batters v Becker
Morris v British Griffin Chilled Iron
& Steel Co ld
Industrials ld v Evison
Beazley v Beazley
Billing v Pittaway
Wilton & ors v Ware & anr
Kelcey v Kelcey
Mills v Mander
Hammond v Sandys
In re James Mitchell, dec Mitchell
& ors v Mitchell & ors
Friary Holroyd & Healy's Breweries
ld v Marine Hotel (Selcely) ld
Hill v Jackson
Colville v Bennie & ors
Pautard v Pautard
Francis & ors v Gordes
Williams v Maxwell (not before
October 24)
Carter v Chapman
Attenborough v Ledgard
Premier Taxameter Co ld v Wad-
dington Bros

In re Trade Mark 405,812 Premier
Taxameter Co ld
In re Trade Marks Acts, 1915 to 1919
Connolly & ors v British Margarine
Trade Supplies ld & ors
Rigg v Newman
MacLaren v Russell & anr
Ward v Ward
Lewis v Demery & Hooley
Norwich Union Life Insure Soc v
Charles
Hauser v Rosen
Gosden v Swales
Malcolmson v Glegg
In re Von Hiller, dec Winslow v
Hiller
Canvey Island Commrs v Preedy
Woodhill Garden Village ld v Welsh
Garden Cities ld
Sendall v Russell
Brinton v Preen
W E Chivers & Sons ld v Corbould-
Warren
Wood v Aircraft Manufacturing Co
ld & anr
Metherell v Cullum
Stone v Oakley
Humphrey v Link
Public Trustee v Richardson
Richardson v Lee
Coverley v Jefferson
Jones D v Jones B
Parkin v Parkin
Harvey v Scott
Jones v Morris
Fox v Jacobson
In re Lowe, dec Caunt v Lowe
Edelsten v Balfour
Greenshields v Wheatley
Thomson v Dunncliffe & Mills
In re Morris, dec Morris v Morris
Neustein v Mason
Simon v Simon
Gihl v Roberts & anr
In re Dunphie, dec Dunphie v
Morgan
Lander v Bassett
Marine & Locomotive Superheaters
ld v Superheater Units ld
Eastern Valleys Black Vein Col-
lieries ld v Ellicd Colliery Co ld
Harvey v Allen
Charteris v Hollis
Townhead Oil Works ld v Rosher-
ville Gardens ld
Before Mr. Justice SARGANT.
Retained Causes for Trial.
(With Witnesses).
In re David Stevens Legg v Stevens
(to be mentioned)
Fowler v Kibble pt. hd. (fixed for
October 19)
Calvert v Marshall
The Golden Bread Co ld v Hem-
mings
Holloway v Collins
Andrews v MacLachlan

EQUITY AND LAW

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.2.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—Sir Richard Stephens Taylor.

James Austen-Cartmell, Esq.

Alexander Dingwall Watson, Esq., K.C.

John George Butcher, Bart., K.C., M.P.

Edmund Church, Esq.

Philip G. Collins, Esq.

Harry Milton Crookenden, Esq.

John Croft Devereil, Esq.

Robert William Dibdin, Esq.

Charles Baker Dimond, Esq.

Deputy-Chairman—L. W. North Hickley, Esq.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Erle, P.C., M.V.O.

John Roger Burrow Gregory, Esq.

Archibald Herbert James, Esq.

Allan Ernest Messer, Esq.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Phillimore, P.C., D.C.L.

Charles R. Rivington, Esq.

Mark Lemon Romer, Esq., K.C.

The Hon. Sir Charles Russell, Bart.

Francis Minchin Voules, Esq., C.B.E.

Charles Wigan, Esq.

FUNDS EXCEED £5,000,000.

All classes of Life Assurance Granted. Whole Life and Endowment Assurances without profits, at exceptionally low rates of premium.

W. P. PHELPS, Manager.

Dudley-Clarke v Dunkley

Pritchard v Potts

Brown v Brown

In re Letters Patent No 142,934 granted to E H Jones & Alloy Welding Process Id (s.o.)

Adjourned Summonses.

In re J T Poyser, dec Landon v Cox

pt. hd. (s.o. to Nov. 7, 1922)

Gordon v Gordon

In re V E Hope, dec Hope v Smith

In re Mair Williamson v French pt. hd. (s.o.)

In re H J Seymour, dec Seymour v Smith

In re W A Wyatt, dec Avon v Wyatt

In re Bellhouse, dec Bellhouse v Bellhouse

In re Legg, dec Legg v Richmond

In re J T Butcher dec Thorpe v Green

In re Batho dec Wimble v Castle

In re Morrison, dec Brown v Morrison

In re Staplee, dec Moore v Ashby

In re Fife's Settlement Public Trustee v Fife

In re Noblett's Settlement Riversdale v Riversdale

In re Stawell's Settlement Riversdale v Riversdale

In re F Mitchell, dec Mitchell v Mitchell

Dessau v Peters, Rushton & Co

Same v Same,

In re F Heath, dec Heath v Heath

In re Emma Venn, dec Venn v Venn

In re F Spring, dec Spring v Spring

In re Moore, dec Hodgson v Moore

In re S C Boulter, dec Capital & Counties Bank v Boulter

In re H P J Warburton, dec Caddy v Warburton

In re A M Ballard, dec Gorst v Coats

In re M C Dowager Duchess of Sutherland, dec Mitchell v Bubna

In re Gainwell, dec Gainwell v Gainwell

In re Henry Potter, dec Rogers v Potter

In re Melville, dec Wimbledon Borough Council v Public Trustee

Falbaum v Klinger Manufacturing Co Id

In re Hopkinson Dyson v Hopkinson

In re Stennett Wells v Reeve

In re Barnes, dec Clarke v Barnes

In re Aspell, dec Crawford v Cheetham

In re Bridgeman-Simpson, dec Fitzwilliam v Hingston

In re North's Settlement

In re Conveyancing Act, 1911

In re Moss, dec Moss v Hands

In re J Barralet, dec Barralet v Shorter

In re James Bolwell, dec Robbins v Sanson

In re J R Thompson, dec Hunter v Thompson

In re Ferry & Marshall & Wilson's Contract In re Vendor & Purchaser Act, 1874

In re Baron Trevor's Settlement Hill v Trevor

Spearing v Edwin Danks & Co (Oldbury) Id

In re F G Chick, dec Chick v Chick

In re Broadwood, dec Public Trustee v Broadwood

In re Tolstoy-Miloslavsky, dec Faire v McBride

In re Harrison, dec Whitworth v Belton

In re Morgan's Will Trust Public Trustee v Foster

In re J Evans, dec Evans v Evans

In re J B Bower, dec Powell v Marsh-Dunn

Hall v Minter

Dadd v Jarmaine

Before Mr. Justice ASTBURY.

Retained Matters.

Motion (by order).

Thompson v British & Colonial Kinematograph Cold(s.o. generally)

Causes for Trial.

(With Witnesses).

Haines v Whitley & Monkseaton

U. D. C. pt. hd.

Crediton Urban District Council v Crediton Gas Co pt. hd.

Frazier v Woodside Garden Suburb Id pt. h.l.

Pudney v Drummond

Johnson v Ireland

Cornhill Syndicate Id v Compendiums Id

Demery v Waller Bros Id

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Lander's Settlement Lander v Lander pt. hd. (s.o. generally)

Boismere & Claydon Union v Woodbridge Union (s.o. generally)

In re Kerrison's Settlement In re Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890 (s.o. generally)

In re Inman Anderson v Inman pt. hd. (s.o. generally)

In re Hatton, dec Hockin v Hatton (s.o. generally)

In re Earnshaw Earnshaw v Earnshaw pt. hd.

In re Cowper, dec In re Von Brandt's Settlement

In re Rogers, dec Rogers v Rogers

In re Milner's Settlement Milner v Milner

In re Joy, dec Carpendale v Joy

In re Housing Acts, 1890 to 1919

In re Lands Clauses Consolidation Act In re Alliance Economic Investment Co Id

In re Gough, dec Hilton v Gough

In re H W Page, dec Child v Page & ors

In re Jennings, dec Heather v Griffiths & ors

Hollands v Cooper

In re Lobito, Benguella & Catumbella Electric Light & Power Co Id Johnstone v The Company

In re Henry Jenkins, dec Cattle v Gordon Boys Home

In re Pritchard-Rayner, dec Upperton v Greene

In re Lovegrove's Settlement Trusts Hanrott v Lovegrove

In re Griess, dec Redfern v Griess

In re H G Close, dec Public Trustee v Close

In re Bulpitt, dec Bulpitt v Bulpitt

In re James Price, dec Forsaith v Clegg

In re B J Sutherland, dec Sutherland v Sutherland

In re Crundall, dec Cauchi v Crundall MacAfee & Co Id v Lycett

Queenborough Wharf Co Id v Jaffray & ors

Lambert & anr v Templeton

In re Remington & Fitzgerald In re Courts (Emergency Powers) Acts 1914 to 1917

In re Huddersfield Spiritualist Church Briggs v Bailey & ors

Hudson v International Young Men's Christian Assoc of North America

In re James Thornton, dec Calvert v Calvert

Pembroke v Commons

Companies (Winding Up) and
Chancery Division.

Companies (Winding Up).

Petitions (to wind up).

Fibre Tube & Box Board Manufacturers Id (petn. of J B Hunt—ordered on Nov. 18, 1919, to stand over generally)

F W Berwick & Co Id (petn. of Stirling Metals Id—s.o. from July 12, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

A Harper Sons & Bean Id (petn. of G Johnston—s.o. from June 14, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

Bentley Priory Id (petn. of J Alfred Pratt and Co Id—s.o. from July 19, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Martinsyde Id (petn. of Alfred Herbert Id—ordered on July 26, 1921, to stand over generally)

W S Laycock Id (petn. of Bagshaw & Co Id & anr—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

Alexander McMillan Id (petn. of C E Harrop—s.o. July 19, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Bridge Paper Mills Id (petn. of Salisbury Supply Co—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Capital & Counties Insee Co Id (petn. of T E Brooke—s.o. from Aug. 31, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

London & General Trade Bank Id (petn. of William John Barnett—ordered on July 26, 1921, to s.o. generally)

Austin Motor Co Id (petn. of Beckett, Laycock and Watkinson Id—s.o. from July 19, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Austin Motor Co Id (petn. of Dunlop Rubber Co Id—s.o. from July 19, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

South Fleetwood Fishing Co Id

(petn. of C Jeffs, Junr—s.o. from Sept. 28, 1921, to Nov. 1, 1921)

Sun Fuel Co Id (petn. of Percy Jose Mitchell—s.o. from July 19, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

Commercial Amalgamations Trust Id (petn. of H M Attorney General—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Western Counties Shipping Co Id

(petn. of Colonial Bank—s.o. from July 19, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

Whitham & Butterworth Id (petn. of Reginald Edward Lindley—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Birmingham & Midland Counties Transport Co Id (petn. of Docker Bros Id—s.o. from June 21, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

Burtons Id (petn. of Great Eastern Ry Co—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

Canada Pacific Iron & Steel Syndicate Id (petn. of Sir John Roper Wright—ordered on July 5, 1921, to s.o. generally)

Sewell & Sewell Id (petn. of N Shaffer—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

W Dennison & Co Id (petn. of Pattison & Co—s.o. from July 12, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

British Ensign Motors Id (petn. of Percy John Smith—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Ex-Officers National Federation (petn. of Arthur Gordon Letchworth—s.o. from July 12, 1921, to Oct. 25, 1921)

Convex Incandescent Mantle Co Id (petn. of Maxim Hanson Hersey—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

M Mazza & Cold (petn. of Merchants Discount Bank Id—s.o. from Aug. 24, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Paynes Ship & Timber Co Id (petn. of Arthur Capel & Co (London) Id—s.o. from July 19, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Machinery & Steels Id (petn. of William Henry Pease—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Ludgate Id (petn. of Armprior Cabinet Id—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Nechi Consolidated Gold Mining Co Id (petn. of R Richards & Co—s.o. from July 19, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Jasper Id (petn. of Rhoda Louisa Carreg—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Risn' Sun Polishes Id (petn. of John Horn (London) Id—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

W G C Hayward & Co Id (petn. of Victoria Tube Co Id—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

New Royalty Kinema (Brixton) Id (petn. of Waltham Id—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Banque Industrielle de Chine (petn. of the Company—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Everybody's Vacuum Cleaner (London) Id (petn. of the Ben Jonson Tobacco Co—s.o. from July 26, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

W T Bailey Id (petn. of Inglesant & Burton—s.o. from Sept. 28, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)

Cinema Combine Id (petn. of Butcher's Film Service Id)

Mid-African & Overseas Properties Id (petn. of Henry Hermann Markwald)

Wooler Motor Cycle Co. (1919) Id (petn. of Bowden Wire Id)
 British Lion Films Id (petn. of Henry Rothfield)
 Tar Burners Id (petn. of W R Sykes Interlocking Signal Co Id)
 Askew & Elliott Id (petn. of Edward Harold Riches)
 Moving Picture Exhibition of British Industries Id (petn. of Henry Slade)
 B B Christie & Co Id (petn. of Emberton Bros)
 Wooler Motor Cycle Co. (1919) Id (petn. of Hille & Sons Id)
 Colour Id (petn. of W S Muir & Co)
 Edward Delfosse Id (petn. of Herbert F Solly Id) (in liquidation)
 British Properties Id (petn. of George Stephens)
 Port Lincoln Copper Co Id (petn. of the Minister of Mines for the State of South Australia)
 Kelly Export Co Id (petn. of M Adam Robinson & Co)
 X.O. Financial Syndicate Id (petn. of John Proctor, a firm)
 Elite Leather Co Id (petn. of Edith Featherston)
 United Kingdom Colonial & Foreign Insee Co Id (petn. of International Insee Co Id)
 Films Cooling Towers Id (petn. of Morton, Down & Co Id)
 Maxim Lamp Works Id (petn. of Carl Quitmann)
 E J Caldicott & Co Id (petn. of S Bersi & Co Id)
 Wilkins, Champion & Wilkins Id (petn. of Ever Ready Co (Great Britain) Id)
 British Properties Id (petn. of Herbert Bamber & Co)
 Sunday Sportsman Id (petn. of Eric Fernstrom)
 Same (petn. of Spalding & Hodge Id)
 London & Suburban Development Co Id (petn. of Bradley & Son Id)
 Newington Clothing Co Id (petn. of A H Lipman)
 British Metal & Toy Manufacturers Id (petn. of W B Tattersall Id)
 Asbada Trust Id (petn. of E A Seitz)
 Walter E Isley Id (petn. of Edwards & Co)
 Hewitt & Vincent Id (petn. of International Trade Exhibitions Id)
 Ernest Lyon Id (petn. of Richard Parry)
 Omnium Trust Corp'n (petn. of John Menzies & Co Id)
 West African Planters Id (petn. of Patoschka & Hultier)
 Powerite Steam Jointing Co Id (petn. of F H Smith)
 Acme Sales Agency Id (petn. of Rexine Id)
 Morris & Tingey Id (petn. of M Woolfe)
 Flightcraft Id (petn. of Runbaken Magneto Co Id)
 Dagnall Id (petn. of Hazeldine Bros)
 Improved Chilling & Transport Id (petn. of E J Edwards)
 Regal Fire & Accident Co Id (petn. of British Isles Marine & General Insee Co Id)
 Trans-Oceanic Shipping & Trading Co Id (petn. of A H Partridge)
 Ross Locknut Co Id (petn. of H J Payne)
 Shipping & Trading Co Id (petn. of Harry Herbert Id)
 Thella Id (petn. of Debenhams Id)

Webbs (1921) Id (petn. of North British Rubber Co Id)
 J W Kitson & Co Id (petn. of G Luck)
 Pelman Institute Id (petn. of Fredk E Potter Id & anr)
 British Improved Construction Co Id (petn. of E Hayes)
 Fitch & Sons, Contractors, Id (petn. of R V Boughton)

Chancery Petitions.

Caxton Insee Co Id (to confirm alteration of objects—ordered on March 15, 1921, to stand over generally)
 Anglo-American Assee Co Id (to confirm alteration of objects—s.o. from March 22, 1921, to Oct. 18, 1921)
 P R Jackson & Co Id & reduced (to sanction Scheme of Arrangement and confirm reduction of capital)
 Fellows, Morton & Clayton Id and reduced (to confirm reduction of capital)
 Mells Collieries Id and reduced (same)
 Pawsons & Leafs Id and reduced (same)
 Robert Hayes Id and reduced (same)
 Walkers Mutual Chaplins Id and reduced (same)
 United African Explorations Id and reduced (same)
 Middleton Estate & Colliery Co Id and reduced (same)
 Lautaro Nitrate Co Id and reduced (same)
 United Lankat Plantations Co Id and reduced (same)
 Ford Id and reduced (same)
 G. W. K. (1919) Id and reduced (same)
 Martinsyde Id (to sanction Scheme of Arrangement—ordered on July 26, 1921, to stand over generally)
 Sumerling & Co Id (to sanction Scheme of Arrangement)
 Universal Automobile Insee Co Id (to confirm alteration of objects)
 Hoover Suction Sweeper Co Id (to confirm alteration of objects)
 H A & D Taylor Id (same)
 Lewis Berger & Sons Id (same)
 Indian & General Investment Trust Id (same)
 Sheffield Telephone (New System) Co Id (same)
 South Wales & Monmouthshire Telephone (New System) Co Id (same)
 Liverpool Telephone (New System) Co Id (same)
 Lancashire & Yorkshire Private Telephone Co Id (same)
 Birmingham Private Telephone (New System) Co Id (same)
 I T C Id (same)
 New System Private Telephone Co Id (same)
 Leeds Private Telephone (New System) Co Id (same)
 Bristol & West of England Telephone (New System) Co Id (same)
 Newcastle Telephone (New System) Co Id (same)

Companies (Winding-up)

Motions.

Angel Steamship Co Id (ordered on April 13, 1920, to stand over generally)
 John Dawson & Co (Newcastle-on-Tyne) Id (stand over generally by consent)
 Samos Wine Co Id (ordered on April 12, 1921, to stand over generally)

S Jacobs & Co Id (ordered on March 15, 1921, to stand over generally)
 H C Motor Id (ordered on July 5, 1921, to stand over generally)

Companies (Winding up). Court Summonses.

Van den Plas (England) Id (on proof of Fiat Motors Id—with witnesses—parties to apply to fix day for hearing).
 Fairbanks Gold Mining Co Id (ordered on July 26, 1921, to stand over generally)
 R Martens & Co Id (on claim of Lady Rhondda—with witnesses)
 Connolly Bros Id (on proof of Hecht, Levis and Kalin) (ordered on June 21, 1921, to stand over generally)
 Same (on proof of Luke O'Reilly Id) (ordered on June 21, 1921, to stand over generally) (retained by Mr. Justice P O Lawrence)
 London County Commercial Re-insurance Office Id (with witnesses)
 Farrow's Bank Id
 W A & R J Jacobs Id (with witnesses)
 Three Counties Engineering Co Id (with witnesses)
 Jubilee Cotton Mills Id (with witnesses)
 Bristol & Dominions Producers Assoc Id
 Blenheim Motor Co Id (with witnesses)
 Chilian Construction Co Id
 Claridge's Patent Asphalt Co Id
 Anna Willson & Co Id (with witnesses)
 British American Continental Bank Id
 Hampton Engineering Co Id

Chancery Division.

French South African Development Co Id Partridge v French South African Development Co Id (on preliminary point—ordered on April 2, 1914, to stand over generally pending trial of action in King's Bench Division)
 Gardiner Shipbuilding & Engineering Co Id Coutts & Co v Gardiner Shipbuilding and Engineering Co Id

Actions for trial.

Philippo & Son Id Shepherd v Philippo & Son Id & ors
 Goswell Clothing Works Id Phillips v Goswell Clothing Works Id

Before Mr. Justice PETERSON.

Retained Matters.

Causes for Trial.

(With witnesses).

Weinberg v Lyons & anr
 Capper v Williams
 Conron & ors v London County Council
 Alabaster v Southwell
 Harris v Newbould (s.o. for settlement)

Further Consideration.

Turner v Farrant
 Adjourned Summonses.

In re Johnson, dec How v Knight
 In re J J Kidman, dec Kidman v Kidman
 In re Alice Price, dec Dean v Redfern
 In re Thomas Berry, dec Berry v Guy
 In re Wagstaff, dec Public Trustee v Jalland
 In re Hancock, dec Budd v Hancock
 In re Leslie Leslie v Leslie
 In re W R Spurr's Estate Peel v Spurr

In re Pearson, dec Hewitt v Murray
 In re Emily Smith, dec Board v Beard & ors
 In re de Lobau, dec Hippisley v Wheeler & ors
 In re Tibbetts, dec Hardeman v Tibbetts
 In re Wicks, dec Emblin v Barker
 In re Wood, dec Warry v Wood
 In re Trechmann, dec Trechmann v Trechmann
 In re Coke's Settled Furniture Crutchley v Coke
 In re E M Jones, dec Pierce v Pinchin
 In re Middleton's Settled Estates Fisher v Middleton
 In re Rumbal, dec Woolven v Rumbal
 In re John Watson, dec Hamilton v Foyster
 In re A W Hall's Settled Estate In re Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890
 In re Burleigh, dec May v Burleigh
 In re Barker, dec Barker v Barker
 In re Levett, dec Legge v Levett
 In re Garrood, dec Public Trustee v Garrood
 In re Holmes, dec Stobart v Holmes & ors
 In re Marshall, dec Kirby v Turney
 In re Danby, dec McNair v Danby
 In re Cannon, dec Judd v Warner
 In re Sturt, dec de Bunsen v Hardinge
 In re Wingham, dec Taylor v Gates
 In re Sprague, dec Chown v Walter
 In re Gore, dec Singleton v Rundle & ors
 In re Famatina Co Id British Canadian & General Investment Co Id v The Company
 In re The Strade Institute of Infant Welfare Fellows v Peel & ors
 In re Collyer, dec Collyer v Collyer
 In re Henry Washbourne, dec Taylor v Cobb
 In re Townner, dec Plummer v Townner
 In re Andrew, dec Andrew v Andrew
 In re Baisrow, dec Rowson v Greaves
 Coe v Procter
 In re Powtress, dec Public Trustee v Workman
 In re Blood's Settlement Currie v Peckham
 In re Paynter, dec Fanning v Fanning
 In re Evans, dec Lougher v Evans
 In re Stannaries Engineering Co Id Paterson v The Company
 In re Cottrell, dec Cottrell v Miles
 In re Eyre-Williams, dec Eyre-Williams v Williams
 In re R F Holmes, dec Folkard v Holmes
 In re Ward, dec Harrison v Ward
 In re Wakley, dec Mosley, Flowers & Co. v Tomlinson
 In re Whelan, dec Doyle & anr v Woodliff & ors
 Schwartz v Schwartz
 In re J A Taylor, dec Taylor v Tweedie
 In re J S Hall, dec Smith v Hall
 Lethouse & anr v Eadon & ors
 In re Opposition by Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton Id
 In re Application of Union Nationale Inter Syndicale des Marques Collectives
 In re Trade Marks Acts
 In re Richard, dec Blakey v Richard
 Before Mr. Justice P. O. LAWRENCE.
 Retained Matters.
 Adjourned Summonses.
 In re Burroughs' Settlement Abbott v Burroughs (s.o.)

THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL.

WHEN CALLED UPON TO ADVISE AS TO LEGACIES, PLEASE DO NOT FORGET THE CLAIMS OF THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL, WHICH IS URGENTLY IN NEED OF FUNDS FOR ITS HUMANE WORK.

In re Princess Dolgorouki, dec
Ewart v Dolgorouki pt. hd.
In re Mansfield, dec Mansfield v
Mansfield & ors (s.o. generally)
In re A J Smith, dec Smith v Smith
In re Richard Ainsworth, dec Mil-
lington v Ainsworth

Motions.

Attorney General v Thames Deep
Water Wharf Id (s.o. October 13)
Webster v Webster

Causes for Trial.
(With Witnesses).

Crouch v Mitchell (s.o. date to be
fixed)
In re West New Jersey Soc. Trusts
Samuel v Howell
Sergeant v Kelly (s.o. for commission)
British Thomson Houston Co Id v
Corona Lamp Works Id
Roberts & ors v Mercantile Issue
Corp Id and anr
Hargraves v Cater
Nicholes v Bailey
Berry v De Gex
Dickson v Anglo-Continental Mines
Co Id
Sturmev v Woolmer
Welton v Welton
Burroughes v Abbott & ors
Jordan v Rintoul
Richardson & Co v Smith
Gunter & Co Id v Jacobsen
In re Gigg, dec Johnson v Hickman
Tannen v Chamberlain
Weir & Thompson v Empson & ors
Craven v L Sherwood Id
Eckstein v Schintz
Duoscope Id v Roughton
Whale v Streathorn Engineering Co
Id
In re Aircraft Manufacturing Co Id
Holgate v The Company
Ellam v Elliott
Denton v Lindsay
Symondson v Owen
Sherman v Cohen
Taylor & anr v Paice & anr
Kramer v Attorney General
Parfitt v Reed
Hughes v Smallpage
Heald v Packing House Products Co
Id
Agnew v Repington
L Huguenin Id & anr v Garstin
Pritchard v Universal Car Co Id

Blatchford v Cory & Grundy Id
Phonotas Co Id v Willox
Attorney General v Brown
In re Organic Research Co Id In re
Companies (Consolidation) Act,
1908

MacFarlane v Trobridge
Hart v Hughes
Carlton Main Colliery Co Id v
Hemsworth R D C
Brown v Brown
E J King Id v British Overseas
Bank Id
In re Thomas Wilmot, dec Wilmot
v Wilmot

Before Mr. Justice RUSSELL.
Retained Matters.

Adjourned Summonses.

Argentine Transandine Ry Co v
Buenos Ayres & Pacific Ry Co
In re H J Bell, dec Public Trustee
v Eden
In re Cawston, dec Behrens v Bell-
Bathurst
In re Barnett Goldberg, dec Foley v
Wharman
In re Edward Steinkopff, dec
Favorke v Steinkopff

Causes for Trial.
(With Witnesses.)

In re A Harper Sons & Bean Id
Bean v The Company (not before
Oct. 26)
Wharton v Garner (restored)
British Bank for Foreign Trade Id
v Russian Commercial & Indus-
trial Bank
Pierpoint v Williamson
Imperial & Foreign Corp Id v
Josephine Chocolates Id (s.o.)
Smith v Goodfellow
Jackson v Bishop
Macdonald v Smith
Fasbender v Attorney General
Davis v J Pullar & Sons
Marshall v Joseph
Raymond v Vickerman
Martin v Reeves
Oppenheimer v Rawnsley
Curzon-Herrick v Jackson
Jarvis v Cotton
Durkin v Durkin
Attorney General v Liverpool Corp
Pioneer Mill Co Id v Fletcher

The Millbrook Engineering Co Id v
Vivian and Sons Id
In re East Kent Amusements Id
Knowles v The Company
Levy v Selbit
Cheesman v Hart
Belton v Bass, Ratcliffe & Gretton Id
Greenhalgh v Catlow
Hilleary v Brandon
Jeffs v Pusser
Torrie v Noel
Sweetland v New Cross Cinema Id
Leavey v Gortner
Gothard v Adamson

Wood v Lush
London County Westminster &
Parr's Bank v The British Email-
lite Co Id
Gough & ors v Marsh
Holder & anr v Hay
Hutchinson v Lion & anr
Pither & ors v Trim
Mahogany Estates & Saw Mills Id v
Harvey
Mehlman v Levy
In re Saul Lyons, dec Saturley v
Lyons
Phillips v Lipman

Crown Office, 29th September, 1921.

Days and places appointed for holding the Autumn Assizes, 1921:—

NORTHERN CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice Swift.

Mr. Justice Acton.

Saturday, 22nd October, at Carlisle.

Thursday, 27th October, at Lancaster.

Monday, 31st October, at Liverpool.

Monday, 21st November, at Manchester.

SOUTH-EASTERN CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice Horridge.

Thursday, 13th October, at Cambridge.

Wednesday, 19th October, at Norwich.

Tuesday, 26th October, at Bury St. Edmunds.

Monday, 31st October, at Chelmsford.

OXFORD CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice Bailhache.

Thursday, 13th October, at Reading.

Saturday, 15th October, at Oxford.

Thursday, 20th October, at Worcester.

Monday, 24th October, at Gloucester.

Friday, 28th October, at Monmouth.

Wednesday, 2nd November, at Hereford.

Saturday, 5th November, at Shrewsbury.

Thursday, 10th November, at Stafford.

WALES AND CHESTER CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice McCaigie.

Thursday, 13th October, at Carnarvon.

Tuesday, 18th October, at Ruthin.

Monday, 24th October, at Chester.

VALUATIONS FOR INSURANCE.—It is very essential that all Policy Holders should have a detailed valuation of their effects. Property is generally very inadequately insured, and in case of loss insurers suffer accordingly. **DEBENHAM STORR & SONS (LIMITED)**, 28, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2, the well-known chattel valuers and auctioneers (established over 100 years), have a staff of expert Valuers, and will be glad to advise those desiring valuations for any purpose. Jewels, plate, furs, furniture, works of art, bric-à-brac a speciality.—[ADVT.]

KING'S BENCH DIVISION.
MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1921.

CROWN PAPER.

For Hearing.

The King v Beverley U D C
The King v Newcastle-upon-Tyne County Court Judge and
Schalit & ors
The King v County Court Judge of West Hartlepool and
Schalit & ors
The King v Schalit & ors
The King v Special Commrs of Income Tax
The King v Governor of Brixton Prison
Margerison v E Hind & Co Id
Beston v Newburys Id
Oakley v Mayor, & of Merthyr Tydfil
Keane v Ashbocking Overseas
The King v Graham-Campbell, Esq. Met Pol Mag & Collins
Taylor v Hecht
Joyce v Cox
Same v Same
Smith v Lynch
McGurk v Dixon & Wife
Melville v Taylor
Houghton v Lees
Norton v Same
The King v Lyon
London County Council v Wettman
Crystal Palace Trustees v Assessment Committee of Croydon
Union
The King v Special Commrs of Income Tax
Wilson & ors v Ministry of Agriculture & Fisheries
Cox v Heaketh
Green v Gloucester Standing Joint Committee
Salmon v Foster
The King v Hupert
The King v Griffiths
The King v Evans
The King v Price
The King v Jones

The King v Same
The King v Worthington
The King v Rowland
The King v Davies
The King v Murdoch
The King v Evans
The King v Meeson
The King v Price, Junr
Dickinson v Bainbridge
The King v Watson, Esq. & anr JJ.
Micklethwaite v Maddison
Binns v Cox
The King v James, Esq. & ors, JJ & Marchant
Mayor, & of Hackney v Dore
Stirk & Sons Id v Halifax Assessment Committee & ors
Latham v Harvey
Leek v Epsom E D C
The King v Markham, Esq. & ors, JJ
Redgrave v Clarke
Ryall v Cubitt Heath & ors
Crang v Leman
Roberts v Rignart
The King v Mayor, & Cambridge
Brown v West Sussex County Council
London County Council v Luxemburg
The King v H M Secretary of State for Home Affairs
Star Cinema (Shepherds Bush) Id v Baker
Ewart v Hughes
The King v Litchingdon Overseers
The King v Same
Young v Jones
Lewellyn v Turner
Mayor, & West Ham v Moss Empires Id
The King v Rose & anr
The King v North, Esq. & ors, JJ
Robinson v Hannon
Spencer v Fox
The King v Wood, Esq. & ors
Dennis v Hutchinson
Same v Hutchinson
Trafford v Same

Evans v Jones & Jones
Godfrey v Higgs, Junr
Blackburn v Skelton

CIVIL PAPER.

For Argument.

Campbell v Ettlinger & Co Id
Svinska Stinkols Aktiebolaget Carl Schlyter v Eleazer
Clark Nortland Navigation Co & anr
Sinon v Churnin
Vigo Motor Trading Corp Id v Knowles (Croydon County
Court)
Pope v Simpson (Birmingham County Court)
Barrett v Hinchcliffe, Stoke & Co Id
Mitsui & Co Id v Donald Campbell & Co
Mann & Cook v H A Walker & Co
Dance v Davis & Aston (Birmingham County Court)
Silverstone & Wife v W Cohen & Wife (Shoreditch County
Court)
Cedling & Hodgkinson Id v Nessim & anr
McKerrow v Matthews & Yates Id
Leader v Stenoff (Bloombsbury County Court)
Prior v Prior (South County Court)
H M Postmaster-General v Mayor & of Liverpool (Liverpool
County Court)
Jolly & Edwards v Parry (Llanrwst County Court)
Adler v Samuel
Greig v Wood & ors (Wandsworth County Court)
H M Sec of State for War v Sims (Folkestone County Court)
Crang v Salmon (Worthing County Court)
Andrews v Merton & Morden U D C (Croydon County Court)
Gale & Co Id v Marshall & French
Pope & Sons v Dixon (Barnet County Court)
Murdoch & Co v Wood (Marylebone County Court)
Smith v Primavesi (Dealing & Ruthin County Court)
Procter v Berkeley (Worcester County Court)
Wilson v The Alliance Economic Investment Co Id (Kingston
County Court)
Parker v C C & T Hoore (Mayor's & City of London Court)

Bentley v Holland & Hannen & Cubitts Ltd
W Hunt & Sons (The Brades) Ltd v Lawler, Ayers & Co Ltd
(City of London Court)
Phillips v Powell & anr (Mayor's & City of London Court)
Veale v Caveas (Marylebone County Court)
Benton v Fry (Harrogate County Court)
W & Boyle & Sons v Woolf (Clerkenwell County Court)
Mellorick v Taylor (Salford County Court)
Stockdale & Doel v Mann & Cook (West Africa) Ltd
Thearle v Andrews (Birkenhead County Court)
Bacon v Cusi (Clerkenwell County Court)
West Wales Motor Transport Co Ltd v Baker
Ball & anr v Thomas & anr (Llanelli County Court)
R.O. Weiner & Cold v F. Jones & Co
Barclays Bank Ltd & ors v Edwin Fox Barnett & Raddeley
Holt v Nixon (Holt, Clint) (Stockport County Court)
See & anr v Hishin (Sugden, Gainshee)
Dognin v Mandelman
Crose v Bowen & Bowen (Leigh County Court)
Pirith v Morton (Kingston-on-Hull County Court)
Hall v Trotter (Bloombsbury County Court)
Nash v Mudmay (Monmouth County Court)
White v Jordan & Pain (Clerkenwell County Court)
White & anr v William & anr (Port Madoc County Court)
Dognin v Mandelman (Westminster County Court)
Conde v Brotherton (Westway County Court)
Sharp v Coape-Arnold (Evesham County Court)
Groves v Holland & Sons (Croydon County Court)
Balkan Tobacco & Products Co Ltd v L.J.H. Grein
South West London Residential Properties Ltd v Hargrove
(Wandsworth County Court)
Newman v Klausner (Mayor's & City of London Court)
Levy Brothers & Knowles Ltd v Marks & Riches Ltd
Squier v Hore (Kingston County Court)
Pulser v Federman (Whitechapel County Court)
Wigglesworth & Co Ltd v James Douglas & Co
Lash v G. Macdonald & Co
Harcourt v Pollard (Bloombsbury County Court)
Shaw v Vermont & Co (Watts, Clint)
Solomon v Astra Films Ltd (Westminster County Court)
Booth v Booth (Oldham County Court)
McCrough v Pearson (Winchester County Court)
National Productions Ltd v Motor Cinemas Ltd (Westminster
County Court)
Allen & Co v Ramsbottom Bros
Northorn v Smythe & anr (West London County Court)
Rowson v Smith (——— County Court)
Rider v Pickett (New Malton County Court)
Smith v Navy & Army Canteen Board
Jinini v Holroyd (West London County Court)
Graham v Rickwood (St. Albans County Court)
Ford v Ford
Golding v Wood Top Manufacturing Co Ltd
Newstead v Daniels
Marsh & anr v Turley (Margate County Court)
Cheltenham Guardians and their Employees
Collinge v Lancashire & Yorkshire Railway Co (Liverpool
County Court)
Holdsworth v Siddons (Bradford County Court)
Fryce & anr v Carter & ors (Bradford County Court)
Jones v F. Burn Ltd (Newport County Court)
DeLaforce v Johnson (Chichester County Court)
Ibbotson v Maygrove & anr (Manchester County Court)
Oller v Goodwin (Birmingham County Court)
Weller v Kersey (Marylebone County Court)
Kanal v Railway Passengers' Assoc Co
Harnard v Goldwin (Brompton County Court)
Rennison v Botley (Wolverhampton County Court)
Pardo v Benabu
Sanderson v Hind (Hexham County Court)
Broomhall v Property Agents & Owners Ltd (Brentford
County Court)
Beale v Sanson Clark & Co. Ltd (Bloombsbury County Court)
Waterman v Fryer (Portsmouth County Court)
Rhodes v Chester & Wife (Wolverhampton County Court)
Stoddart v Hessler & Co (West Hartlepool County Court)
Cooke v San (West Hartlepool County Court)

Savory v Supriawald & ors (Castle Motor Co Ltd, Gainshee)
Chandmull Moolchand v C. Weis & Cold
Silver v Silver
Ritchie v W. Jacks & Cold
Vessey v Sylvester (Spilshy County Court)
Parker v Broomhall & anr (Hitchin County Court)
Ginsburg v Bodingtons (Brighton County Court)
Tuckfield & ors v Hayes (Swansea County Court)
Jose v Kinsman (Camelford County Court)
Forster v New Coliseum (Whitley Bay) Ltd (Newcastle County
Court)
Nicholson & anr v Johnston
Morrison v Parkinson
Aman v Isle of Wight RDC (Hampshire County Court)
Duke of Richmond & ors v Dewar & The Cadogan Hotel Ltd
Markham v Pack & Waghorn
Anbateios v Girace Bros & Co Ltd
Godsell & Sons Ltd v Payne (Gloucester County Court)

SPECIAL CASES UNDER SEC. 19 OF THE ARBITRATION ACT, 1889.

Aistrup v Morcarvar Ltd
Blackett Magallhes & Colombe Ltd v Brown & Co
Cumberland County Council v Mayor, &c of City of Carlisle
Fairclough, Dohd & Jones Ltd v J.M. Steele & Co
Ayscough v Sheeh Thompson & Co Ltd

SPECIAL PAPER.

Hudson's Bay Co v Domingo Mumbri S.A.
Same v Same (motion)
Societa Granaria Italiana v Shaw, Son & Co
Betts & Laysell Ltd v Produce Brokers Co Ltd
Weddel Beef Co v L. & C. Van Staay
Clements v Insee Committee for the County of Devon
Vulcan Chemical Co v Manchester & Liverpool Trading Co Ltd
of Liverpool
Forbes, Forbes, Campbell & Cold v Pelling, Stanley & Cold
Same v Same (motion)
Henry W. Peabody & Co v Ralli Bros
Stephen Hartley & Co v F.C. & J. Dyke
P & O Steam Navigation Co v Comms for Lord High Admiral
of United Kingdom
J. Taylor & Sons Ltd v Cox, McEwen & Co
Moss v Norwich & London Accident Insee Assoc
Produce Brokers Co Ltd v Grahams & Co
Garra v Compton International de Commission de Paris
Marine Navigation Co Ltd v Minister Francaise de Ravitailment
et des Transports Maritimes
Same v Same
Same v Same
Mayor, &c of Hastings v Hastings Tramway Co
Cropper & Cold v Foyle
Ardeshire, Bonanji, Dulash & anr v The Shipping Controller
Olympia Cattle Forwards Ltd v Reuben, Burbage & Clark
Same v Same (motion)
Samuel Sanday Ltd v Cox, McEwen & Co
Peninsular & Oriental Branch Service v Commonwealth
Shipping Representation
James C. Barr Ltd v Gilbert & Knowles
H. & W. Paul Ltd v W.H. Plim, Junr & Cold
Acratopulo & Sons v Ministry of Food
Same v Same (motion)
Bird & Co v Ballins & Bomarevy
Same v Same (motion)
Owners of City of Amiens v Watson & Youell
Wood Top Manufacturing Co Ltd v Golding
Anis Swain & Co v Conner Rice Mills Ltd
W.H. Watson & Co v Produce Brokers Co Ltd
Rutherford, Sender & Cold v Goldthorpe, Scott & Wright Ltd
Wyer & Hawke v Produce Brokers Co Ltd
Owners of S.S. Kincaidline v W.H. Muller & Co (London) Ltd
Owners of S.S. Strom v Compania Mercantil Argentina
Owners of S.S. Taransay v W.H. Muller & Co (London) Ltd
London Transport Co Ltd v Birkern & Christensen

Henry W. Peabody & Co v Ralli Bros
Solomon Golding v A.H. Jefferies & Co Ltd
Same v Same (motion)

APPEALS AND ISSUES UNDER THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1920.

In the Matter of an Application by Guest & ors (de Mary
Sale) pt. hd.
Same (de Azile B. Mullis) pt. hd.
Same (de Kate Croft) pt. hd.
Same (de Eva Croft) pt. hd.
Same (de Amy Hales) pt. hd.
Same by Junior Carlton Club (to be mentioned Oct. 16)
Same by North & Ingram
Same by Rev John Manisty Hardwick (s.o. Oct. 10)
Same by Rev A. A. David, D.D. (s.o. Oct. 10)
Same by Lt Col G. E. Sharp (s.o. Oct. 10)
Same by A. E. Brambleby (de M. Hayden)
Same by G. P. Fuller (de J. Smith)
Same by H. E. Bryant (de C. F. Grundy)
Same by J. S. Vellacott (de A. V. Wright)
Same by McClintock (de Geary)
Same by Hogarth (de Gardner)
Same by Brocklebank (de Amos)
Same by Brocklebank (de Stewart)
Same by Fuller (de Head)
Same by Fuller (de John Gray)
Same by Bovill (de Orvis)
Same by Bovill (de Dale)
Same by Bovill (de Gialger)
Same by Bovill (de Knight)
Same by Kensington (de Knight)
Same by Kensington & Fulham General Hospital (de Mizen)
Same by E. Archdall Fooks (de Riggs)

REVENUE PAPER.

CASES STATED.

The Plymouth Mutual Co-operative & Industrial Soc Ltd and
The Comms of Inland Revenue
Mark Bromet and James Reth (Surveyor of Taxes)
H. G. Alexander, J. G. Duplessis & Lady K. F. M. Morant,
Trustees of John Morant (Minor) and T. H. Butcher
(Surveyor of Taxes)
Neville, Reid & Cold and The Comms of Inland Revenue
Reinach, Nephew & Co and The Comms of Inland Revenue
Port of London Authority and The Comms of Inland
Revenue
The Far Famed Cake Co Ltd and The Comms of Inland
Revenue
A. F. Pool (Inspector of Taxes) and The Guardian Investment
Trust Co Ltd
Bourne & Hollingsworth and The Comms of Inland Revenue
The Comms of Inland Revenue and Engineering Ltd
The Lincoln Wagon & Engine Co Ltd and The Comms of
Inland Revenue
The Comms of Inland Revenue and J. Smith & Sons (Music
Sellers) Ltd
The Comms of Inland Revenue and The Merliman Rubber
Estates Ltd
The Merliman Rubber Estates Ltd and The
Comms of Inland Revenue
The Currall Metals & Munitions Co Ltd and The Comms of
Inland Revenue
The Comms of Inland Revenue and The Gas Lighting
Improvement Co Ltd

PETITION UNDER FINANCE ACT, 1894.

In the Matter of the Estate of Sir Tatton Berenuto Mark
Sykes, Bt, dec
LAND VALUES—APPEALS FROM DECISION OF REFEREE.
Sir Berkeley Sheffield, Bart v The Comms of Inland Revenue

DEATH DUTIES.

In the Matter of Arthur George Earl of Wilton, dec

THE LICENSES AND GENERAL INSURANCE CO., LTD.,

CONDUCTING THE INSURANCE POOL for selected risks.

**FIRE, BURGLARY, LOSS OF PROFIT, EMPLOYERS', FIDELITY, GLASS,
MOTOR, PUBLIC LIABILITY, ETC., ETC.**

Non-Mutual except in respect of **PROFITS** which are distributed annually to the Policy Holders.

THE POOL COMPREHENSIVE FAMILY POLICY at 4/6 per cent. is the most complete policy ever offered to householders.

THE POOL COMPREHENSIVE SHOPKEEPERS' POLICY Covers all Risks under One Document for One Inclusive Premium.

LICENSE INSURANCE.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Suitable Clauses for Insertion in Leases and Mortgages of
Licensed Property settled by Counsel will be sent on application.

For Further Information write: **VICTORIA EMBANKMENT** (next Temple Station), W.C.2.

Winding-up Notices.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.
CREDITORS MUST SEND IN THEIR CLAIMS TO THE
LIQUIDATOR AS NAMED ON OR BEFORE
THE DATE MENTIONED.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, September 30.

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE WATER SYNDICATE LTD. Nov. 14.
Geoffrey Bostock, 21, Ironmonger-lane.
C. COOMBS & CO. LTD. Oct. 31. B. T. Crew, 1, George-st.,
West Eton.
TAYLOR, SON & ROBERTS LTD. Oct. 17. W. T. Hewitt,
77, Colmore-row, Birmingham.
WILLAR & COMPANY LTD. Oct. 30. E. Leonard Jones,
105, Colmore-row, Birmingham.
PENYDARREN BRICK AND COAL CO. LTD. Oct. 25. F. A.
Phillips, Post Office-bldg., John-st., Merthyr Tydfil.
G. H. T. CO. (I.O.M.) LTD. Nov. 1. J. R. Dickin, 37, Moor-
fields, Liverpool.
HESPERIA NEWSPAPER CO. LTD. Oct. 18. S. G. Cole,
48, Gresham-st., E.C.
RENEW LAMP CO. (EASTERN) LTD. Nov. 2. Capt. H. D.
Carry, 3/4, Great Winchester-st.
WESLEY & CO. LTD. Oct. 15. Mr. A. B. Chater, 5, Alexandra-
st., Cambridge.
WILLIAM HOLLAND & SONS LTD. Oct. 31. Thomas Baxter,
28, Hamilton-sq., Birkenhead.
THE BRITISH DWELLINGS SUPPLY CO. LTD. Oct. 13.
Mr. J. A. Evans, 51-53, High-st., Merthyr Tydfil.
J. H. OPENSHAW LTD. Oct. 22. J. L. Merchant, Bank-st.,
Bury.
CAPFYN & SON LTD. Nov. 8. E. Kelsham Bishop, 40A, Wood-
grange-rd., E.7.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, October 4.

THE BRIGHTON, HOVE AND PRESTON UNITED OMNIBUS CO.
LTD. Nov. 15. John Jackson Clark, James Bradford and
Frank Smith, 5, Stoney-st., Brighton.
JOHN ACKLAND & CO. LTD. Oct. 23. Maurice Jenks, 6, Old
Jewry, E.C.
TORQUAY NEW GOLF COURSE CO. LTD. Nov. 7. Ernest
Hutchings, 2, Vaughan-pde, Torquay.
G. & C. WATERLOW LTD. Nov. 15. John H. Dodds, 10, Dale-
st., Liverpool.
LONDON & SCOTCH ENGINEERING CO. LTD. Oct. 31. George
B. Hewitt, 156, Strand.
W. HOLMES & SONS LTD. Nov. 4. Horace E. Nier, 99, Cheapside.
W. R. K. SYNDICATE LTD. Oct. 24. Edward W. Edsall, 32,
Fenchurch-st., E.C.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, September 30.

St. Pancras Garage Ltd. The Driffield Temperance Hall
Eye Bolts Ltd. Co. Ltd.
Brithdir Dwellings Supply
Co. Ltd.
Benson Harries Ltd. Pen-y-darren Brick and Coal
Co. Ltd.
G. H. T. CO. (I.O.M.) Ltd. Fen Farming Co. Ltd.
Deangee Ltd. British & Foreign Providers
Ltd.
Renew Lamp Co. (Eastern)
Ltd. Improved Chilling & Trans-
port Ltd.
C. J. Thursfield & Co. (Locks)
Ltd. Forest Car Co. Ltd.
North Warwickshire Water
Syndicate Ltd. Peters, Rushton & Co. Ltd.
J. G. Bennett & Co. Ltd. The Sheepen Garage Ltd.
Bassett (Salford) Ltd. Aysh, Nye & Co. Ltd.
The Stage Pictorial Publishing
Co. Ltd. Huddersfield Clothing Manu-
facturing Co. Ltd.
The Bedford Mill Paper
Works Ltd. Egdam Motor Co. Ltd.
United Grocers' Association
Ltd. Boyce Motor Accessories
Ltd.
Miller & Woodward Ltd. Kelmscott Publishing Co. Ltd.
The Meta Engineering Co.
Ltd.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, October 4.

Robert Cain & Sons Ltd. Cinemachines Ltd.
The Brighton, Hove and
Preston United Omnibus
Co. Ltd. Corinthian Sports Co. Ltd.
The International Picture and
Show Card Framing Co. Ltd. E. T. Allen Ltd.
Star Music Publishing Co. Ltd. The "Ajax" Bolt & Nut Co.
Meadowcroft's (Manchester)
Ltd. Rosenthals (Continental) Ltd.
British Art Films Ltd. Alfreton and District Steam
Laundry Co. Ltd.
Hulands Motors Ltd. Harvey Free Co. Ltd.
Vauxhall Glass Manufacturing
Co. Ltd.

Bankruptcy Notices.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, September 30.

ALLDIS, PHILIP J., Watford. Barnet. Pet. Sept. 27. Ord.
Sept. 27.
ALLWRIGHT, E. W., Fishersgate, Sussex. Brighton. Pet.
Sept. 15. Ord. Sept. 27.
BARNES, JOSEPH W., Wisbech Saint Peter. King's Lynn.
Pet. Sept. 26. Ord. Sept. 26.
BELLECONTE, HENRY, Streatham. High Court. Pet.
Aug. 9. Ord. Sept. 26.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H. T., Market-st., Jermyn-st. High
Court. Pet. July 4. Ord. Sept. 26.

BESFORD, HERBERT, Liverpool. Liverpool. Pet. Sept. 28.
Ord. Sept. 28.
BUTLER, J. H., Preston. High Court. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord.
Sept. 26.
CAPPS, CHARLES SAMUEL, Lowestoft. Great Yarmouth.
Pet. Sept. 26. Ord. Sept. 26.
CHEVREY, STANLEY S., Ilford. High Court. Pet. Sept. 27.
Ord. Sept. 27.
CLARKE, WILLIAM, Sheffield. Sheffield. Pet. Sep. 9. Ord.
Sept. 26.
COHEN, RALPH, Brushfield-st. High Court. Pet. Sept. 6.
Ord. Sept. 26.
COOK, FRED, Ulverston. Barrow-in-Furness. Pet. Sept. 28.
Ord. Sept. 28.
CRAWFORD, THOMAS, Middlesbrough. Middlesbrough.
Pet. Sept. 12. Ord. Sept. 23.
DENN, CHARLES L., Windsor. High Court. Pet. June 16.
Ord. Sept. 26.
DICKINSON, ALBERT, South Shields. Sunderland. Pet. July 8.
Ord. Sept. 27.
DIXON, HENRY, Stockton-on-Tees. Stockton-on-Tees.
Pet. Sept. 26. Ord. Sept. 26.
ENDALL, GEORGE W., St. Helens. Liverpool. Pet. Sept. 27.
Ord. Sept. 27.
FOSSITT, JAMES E., Boston, Lincs. Boston. Pet. Sept. 26.
Ord. Sept. 26.
GANDY, JESSE A., Barnsley. Barnsley. Pet. Sept. 27. Ord.
Sept. 27.
GOULD, WILLIAM, Wardour-st. High Court. Pet. Sept. 28.
Ord. Sept. 28.
HARDMAN, GEORGE, Bradshaw, near Bolton. Bolton. Pet.
Sept. 28. Ord. Sept. 28.
HAWKINS, WILLIAM, Bristol. Bristol. Pet. Sept. 28. Ord.
Sept. 28.
HUGHES, GEORGE, Lawshall, Suffolk. Bury St. Edmunds.
Pet. Sept. 26. Ord. Sept. 26.
JENKINS, JOSEPH, Kingswood, Bristol. Bristol. Pet. Sept. 26.
Ord. Sept. 27.
JONES, WILLIAM E., Banbury. Banbury. Pet. Sept. 24.
Ord. Sept. 26.
KENWORTHY, AMY C., Beaulieu-rd. Station, Hants. East-
bourne. Pet. July 19. Ord. Sept. 27.
KREPPHOFF, EDWIN, Manchester. Manchester. Pet. Aug. 20.
Ord. Sept. 26.
LLOYD, EVA E., Cardiff. Cardiff. Pet. Sept. 27. Ord. Sept. 27.
LOWE, JOSEPH, Blackpool. Blackpool. Pet. Sept. 24.
Ord. Sept. 24.
MARSH, MATILDA, Bristol. Bristol. Pet. Sept. 28. Ord.
Sept. 28.
MARSHALL, JOHN, Todmorden. Burnley. Pet. Sept. 12.
Ord. Sept. 26.
MASELL, ALFRED, Pontefract. Wakefield. Pet. Sept. 24.
Ord. Sept. 24.
MEASURES, ELLEN L., St. Leonards-on-Sea. Hastings.
Pet. Sept. 27. Ord. Sept. 27.
MENDES, JOSEPH, Oxford-st. High Court. Pet. Sept. 26.
Ord. Sept. 26.
PARKER, THOMAS, the younger, Liverpool. Liverpool.
Pet. Sept. 28. Ord. Sept. 26.
PERCIVAL, FRED, Manchester. Manchester. Pet. Sept. 13.
Ord. Sept. 28.
PERCIVAL, STANLEY, Manchester. Manchester. Pet. Sept. 13.
Ord. Sept. 28.
PETERS, ISRAEL, Liverpool. Liverpool. Pet. Sept. 22.
Ord. Sept. 26.
PETHER, HERBERT R. J., Oxford. Oxford. Pet. Sept. 10.
Ord. Sept. 26.
PURY, JOHN THOMAS, Littleport, Cambs. Cambridge.
Pet. Sept. 26. Ord. Sept. 26.
SERAL, A., Church-lane, Commercial-rd. High Court. Pet.
June 30. Ord. Sept. 26.
STOKER, HARRY, Brighouse. Halifax. Pet. Sept. 26. Ord.
Sept. 26.
SWIFT, ARTHUR, Harrogate. Harrogate. Pet. Sept. 27.
Ord. Sept. 27.
TORRES, SOLOMON D., Manchester. Manchester. Pet. Aug. 31.
Ord. Sept. 26.
WOLLIDGE, GEORGE H., Lewisham. Greenwich. Pet. Aug. 16.
Ord. Sept. 27.
YATES, LOUIS, Manchester. Manchester. Pet. Sept. 13.
Ord. Sept. 28.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, October 4.

ADAMSON, A. W., Staintondale, Yorks. Scarborough. Pet.
Sept. 30. Ord. Sept. 30.
ASTRAUCKAS, S., Merthyr Tydfil. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet.
Sept. 29. Ord. Sept. 29.
BARKER, A., Blackburn. Blackburn. Pet. Sept. 29. Ord.
Sept. 29.
BARRELL, J., Old Kent-rd. High Court. Pet. Aug. 16.
Ord. Sept. 30.
BASSETT, F., Wisbech. King's Lynn. Pet. Sept. 29. Ord.
Sept. 29.
BAXTER, G., Bolton. Bolton. Pet. Sept. 12. Ord. Sept. 28.
BEAL, A. F., Streatham. Wandsworth. Pet. May 9. Ord.
Sept. 29.
BOWEN, J., Buxton. Stockport. Pet. Sept. 1. Ord. Sept. 26.
CHESTER, J. H., Liverpool. Liverpool. Pet. July 16. Ord.
Sept. 28.
DANNY, J., Forest Gate. High Court. Pet. Aug. 29. Ord.
Sept. 30.
DAVISON, C. E., Dover. Canterbury. Pet. Sept. 30. Ord.
Sept. 30.
DRAN, H. R. S., Chiswick. High Court. Pet. Aug. 25. Ord.
Sept. 30.
DEGATE, E., Wallasey. Liverpool. Pet. Sept. 9. Ord.
Sept. 29.
FAIRLEY, R. H., Birmingham. Birmingham. Pet. Sept. 8.
Ord. Sept. 29.
FOX, A. C., Cardiff. Cardiff. Pet. Sept. 30. Ord. Sept. 30.
GODWIN, F., Loxley, Warwick. Pet. Sept. 29. Ord. Sept. 29.
HALL, THOMAS & CO., Reddish. Stockport. Pet. Aug. 23.
Ord. Sept. 29.

HARGRAVE, J. W., Middlesbrough. Middlesbrough. Pet.
Sept. 28. Ord. Sept. 28.
HYNES, J. A. H., Grimsby, Suffolk. Ipswich. Pet.
Sept. 30. Ord. Sept. 30.
JACKSON, A. E., Reddish. Stockport. Pet. Sept. 30. Ord.
Sept. 30.
JEFFS, J., Brighton. Brighton. Pet. Oct. 1. Ord. Oct. 1.
JOHNSON, A. J. K. F., Plumico. High Court. Pet. July 29.
Ord. Sept. 28.
KEATIS, H., Old Montague-st. High Court. Pet. Aug. 26.
Ord. Sept. 28.
LATHAEN, A., Sunderland. Sunderland. Pet. Sept. 27. Ord.
Sept. 27.
LEANEY, F. J. W., St. Bride-st. High Court. Pet. Aug. 29.
Ord. Sept. 28.
LE QUEREUX, F. H., Great Portland-st. High Court. Pet.
Aug. 23. Ord. Sept. 28.
LOREN-PETHER, S. W., Blaenavon. Tredegar. Pet. Sept. 26.
Ord. Sept. 28.
MAUDE, D., Barrow. Barrow-in-Furness. Pet. Sept. 29.
Ord. Sept. 29.
MAUTNER, J., Kilburn. High Court. Pet. July 21. Ord.
Sept. 28.
McMASTER, J., and TAYLOR, R. B., Leeds. Leeds. Pet.
Sept. 28. Ord. Sept. 28.
MORGAN, E. S., Oxford-st. High Court. Pet. Aug. 29. Ord.
Sept. 28.
NORRIS, F. H., Sandon, Staffs. Stafford. Pet. Sept. 29.
Ord. Sept. 29.
OGER, D., Peckham. High Court. Pet. Sept. 14. Ord.
Sept. 27.
O'ROURKE, H., Hampstead. High Court. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord.
Sept. 28.
PRESCOTT, W., Darwen. Blackburn. Pet. Sept. 30. Ord.
Sept. 30.
READE, H. G., Great Grimby. Great Grimby. Pet.
Sept. 30. Ord. Sept. 30.
RICHARDS, W. A., Barnes. Wandsworth. Pet. Aug. 8. Ord.
Sept. 29.
SHARPE, G., Gateshead. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. Aug. 22.
Ord. Sept. 28.
SLESSICK, A. M., Sheffield. Sheffield. Pet. Sept. 28. Ord.
Sept. 28.
SMITH, J. I., Malda Vale. High Court. Pet. Aug. 29. Ord.
Sept. 29.
STEWART, K. W., H.M. Ship "Warspite." High Court. Pet.
Aug. 17. Ord. Sept. 29.
STEWART, Captain W. J., Stratford-pl. High Court. Pet.
Aug. 6. Ord. Sept. 29.
TAYLOR, F. S., Islington. High Court. Pet. Oct. 1. Ord.
Oct. 1.
WEBB, T. H., Great Smith-st. High Court. Pet. Aug. 5.
Ord. Sept. 8.
WHITFORD, A. & CO., Seacombe. Birkenhead. Pet. Sept. 23.
Ord. Sept. 28.
WOODHAM, J. E., Milnsbridge, nr. Huddersfield. Hudders-
field. Pet. Sept. 30. Ord. Sept. 30.
ZEITUN, H. S., Malda Vale. High Court. Pet. Aug. 25. Ord.
Sept. 29.

GREGG SHORTHAND.

Based on Longhand. One Slope.
No Shading. No Position Writing.

Send 2d. Stamp for "First Lessons" Booklet.

GREGG PUBLISHING CO., 7, Garrick St., W.C.2.

SINCE WHEN? Is English Spelling alone
after so many changes, to be kept henceforth for ever
exempt from change? Customs, laws, religions, arts,
sciences, ideas, words, all things of life and value
change. Is English spelling the one perfect and
immutable thing. If so, since when?

WRITE FOR FREE LITERATURE:

THE SIMPLIFIED SPELLING SOCIETY,
44, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

MISS COWAN'S
TYPEWRITING OFFICE,
23a, Craven Street, Northumberland Avenue, W.C.2.

Shorthand. Typewriting. Duplicating.
Translations.
Dictation and Evening work arranged for.
TELEPHONE:—GERRARD 7055.

BRAND'S A1 SOUPS.

IN TINS AND BOTTLES.
Prepared from the finest Materials
procureable, with the utmost care.
Over 30 different Varieties.

Of all Grocers, Stores, &c.

EVIDENCE

on behalf of Christianity is provided by the
CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY,
33 and 34, Craven Street, W.C.2.

BRASS NAME PLATES FOR BUSINESS AND
PRIVATE HOUSES &c.
MAILE & SON, ENGRAVERS, 246 Gt. Portland Street, LONDON W.

GENERAL INDEX.

For Classified Articles, see Appointments; Correspondence; Current Topics; Leading Articles;
Miscellaneous; New Orders; Obituary; Reviews; Societies.

APPOINTMENTS AND HONOURS.

Acton, Mr. Justice—Master of the Bench of the Inner Temple, 121
Adkins, Sir Wm. Ryland, K.C., M.P.—Recorder of Birmingham, 101
Ashton, Mr. Arthur Jacob, K.C.—H.C. Judge of the Isle of Man, 703
Bagshaw, Mr. William—Town Clerk of Doncaster, 523
Barker, Mr. Geoffrey H. M.—Coroner for the Winslow District, 330
Barnes, Mr. T. J.—Solicitor to the Board of Trade, 244
Bateson, Mr. A. D., K.C.—Master of the Bench of the Inner Temple, 121
Beresford, Mr. Leonard B.—Town Clerk of Southend, 773
Bradburne, Mr. Chas. Randal—Official Solicitor to Supreme Court, 162
Branson, Mr. George Arthur Harwin—High Court Judge, 523
Bremner, Mr. A. M. B.—Treasurer of the Inner Temple, 1921, 178
Brown, Mr. Thomas Watters, K.C., M.P.—Solicitor-General for Ireland, 646
Carson, The Right Hon. Sir Edward, K.C.—Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, 615
Champness, Major W. H.—Chief Clerk to Undersheriff, 841
Clode, Mr. W. B., K.C.—Master of the Bench of Inner Temple, 121
Collins, Sir Godfrey Patterson, K.B.E., C.M.G., M.P.—to be one of the Charity Commissioners, 121
Coward, Sir John Charles Lewis, K.C.—Railway and Canal Commissioner, 264
Cunliffe, Mr. Joseph Herbert, K.C.—Attorney-General of the Duchy of Lancaster, 615
Darley, Mr. Frederick William—Official Receiver for Bankruptcy, District C.C. Portsmouth, 279
Deighton, Mr. T. Howard—Under-Sheriff for the City of London, 857
Dowdall, Mr. Harold Chaloner, K.C.—Judge of County Court, 615
Duke, The Right Hon. Sir Henry—Representative of Gray's Inn on the Council of Legal Education, 405
Farrer, Mr. Bryan—Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, 64
Gibbon, Mr. Douglas Stuart (M.C.)—Office of Taxing Master, 801
Given, Mr. H. M.—Junior Counsel to the Treasury, 539
Goodman, Sir Gerald Aubrey—Chief Justice of the Straits Settlements, 142
Greaves-Lord, Mr. Walter, K.C.—Commissioner of Assize, N.E. Circuit, 178
Greer, The Hon. Mr. Justice—Treasurer of Gray's Inn, 1921, 142
Guthrie, Dr. R. L., O.B.E.—Coroner for the Eastern District of London, 209
Hedley, Mr. Walter—Recorder of Richmond, Yorks., 209
Henry, Mr. Denis, K.C., M.P.—L.C. Justice of Northern Ireland, 786
Hooson, Mr. J. D.—Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for Chester and N. Wales, &c., 279, 315
Hopkinson, Sir Alfred, K.C.—Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn, 1921, 162
Humphreys, Mr. Travers—Recorder of Chichester, 264
Johnston, Mr. Gaston—to be one of H.M.'s Counsel for Trinidad, 841
King's Counsel, 347, 703
Knight, Mr. A. Charles—Clerk to the Ancient City Guild of Gold and Silver Wyre Drawers, 64

Lailey, His Hon. Judge Barnard, K.C.—Chairman of Second Court, Hants Quarter Sessions, 226
Lawrence, Sir Alfred Tristram—Lord Chief Justice of England, 523
Leek, Mr. D. C., K.C.—elected Bencher Middle Temple, 501
Lloyd, Mr. E. Honoratus, K.C.—Recorder of Chester, 244
Mason, Lieut.-Col. Daniel J., D.S.O.—Coroner for West Cumberland, 81
Matthews, The Rev. W. R., M.A., B.D.—Chaplain to Gray's Inn, 142
McCall, Mr. Robert Alfred, K.C.—Registrar attached to the Railway and Canal Commission Court, 558
Metcalfe, Mr. William Austin—Recorder of Lincoln, 264
Meynell, Mr. Edgar—Recorder of Doncaster, 857
Micklethwait, Mr. St. John Gore—Bencher of Middle Temple, 279
Mills, Mr. John Frobisher—Chief Charity Commissioner, 833
Morison, The Right. Hon. T. B., K.C., M.P.—Bencher of Gray's Inn, 501
Morris, Mr. Harold Spencer, M.B.E., K.C.—Recorder of Folkestone, 365
Nelson, Mr. A. E.—elected Bencher of the Middle Temple, 501
Nesbitt, Mr. Robt. Chancellor—Chairman of Special Training Grants Committee, 756
Ogden, Mr. John Basil—Town Clerk of Bath, 441
Oliver, Mr. Roland Giffard—Third Junior Prosecuting Counsel, C.C. Ct., 365
Pollock, Mr. Dighton Nicolas—Junior Counsel to the Treasury, 646
Randolph, Mr. J. R., K.C.—Judge of County Courts, 347
Ritchie, Mr. C. F.—Secretary to Charity Commissioners, 833
Roberts, Mr. R. Mills—Deputy Coroner for Liverpool, 32
Schwabe, Mr. W. G. S., K.C.—Commissioner of Assize, N.E. Circuit, 724
Sebastian, Mr. Lewis Boyd—Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, 756
Shaw, Mr. John Houldsworth—Solicitor to the Board of Inland Revenue, 809
Shaw, Mr. Walter Sidney—Chief Justice of the Straits Settlements, 631
Simmons, Major Percy Coleman—Chairman of L.C.C., 405
Simons, Mr. Gavin—Junior Counsel to Board of Trade in Foreshore Cases, 646
Smith, Mr. C. Herbert—Judge of County Courts, 809
Tee, Mr. Richard Harry—Town Clerk of Hackney, 441
Thomas, Major Francis Danford—Coroner for the Liberty of the Tower, 50
Thorpe, Mr. John Henry—to represent the Crown in Court of Criminal Appeal, 405
Tobin, His Hon. Judge Sir A. A., K.C.—Commission of Assize, N. Circuit, 226
Vivian, Mr. S. P.—Registrar-General Ministry of Health, 264
Wallace, Mr. G. W.—Charity Commissioner, 835
Walton, Mr. George O'Donnell—Chief Justice of Grenada, 298
Watson, Mr. Ernest Charles—Judge Supreme Court Straits Settlements, 703
Whitaker, Mr. Harry Isaac—Librarian Lincoln's Inn Library, 298
Young, Mr. Hugo J., K.C.—Recorder of Nottingham, 162
Young, Mr. Hugo J., K.C.—Commissioner of Assize N.E. Circuit, 226

CORRESPONDENCE.

Advowson, Sale of, 172
Agriculture Act, 1920, 290, 309
Agriculture Bill, 73
Alterations at the Law Courts, 7

Correspondence (continued).

- Brougham, Lord, and some corrections, 133
 Concerning Solicitors, 24
 Consideration for a Sale under the Settled Lands Acts, 309, 325
 Corporation Profits Tax and Property Owning Companies, 341
 Corpse Ways, 7, 24, 59, 74
Davies v. Bristol—Penrhos College v. Butler, 92
 Domestic Servants and Unemployment Insurances, 733, 751
 Fees of Process Servers, 43
 Finance Bill, 751
 French Decision on Rate of Exchange, Re, 713
Glebe Sugar v. Trustees of Greenock, 376
 Hypnosis and Investigation into Crime, 395
 Increase of Rent, etc., 43, 92, 825
 Inscription on the Law Society's War Memorial, 432, 472
 Juries (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1920, 551
 Lady "Chairman," 309
 Law of Property Bill and Intestacy, 664
 Life Assurance by Friendly Societies, 603
 Measure of Damages in Hiring Contracts, 682
 Origin of Trade Unions, 550
 Prerogative of the King's Proctor, 713
 Prescriptive Claims to Judicial Office, 432
 Rent Restriction Act—Decorative Repair, 664, 682
Scully v. Scully, 697
 Solicitors' War Memorial, 290
 Unconstitutional Resolution, An, 531
 Vocation of a Solicitor, 24
 Waiver by Statutory Acceptance of Rent, 831
 Wearo Murder, 603
 Yorkshire's Welcome to the Law Society, 838

CURRENT TOPICS.

- Abuse of Poor Persons Procedure, 622
 Acceleration of Remainders, 320
 Additional Judge, 486
 Adduction of Evidence, 564
 Administration Bonds, 234, 334
 Administration of Justice Bill, 182, 198
 Administration Rules, New, 708
 Agitators and Lord Eldon, 269
 Agriculture Bill, 54, 86, 268, 285, 334, 410, 635, 688
 Alternative Accommodation, 836
 Alternative Liability of Marine and Fire Underwriters, 448
 Alternative Methods of Selecting Jurors, 335
 Ambiguous Contradiction of Rights, 39
 Amenities of Business Offices, 286
 American Legal Humours, 20
 Ancient and Inveterate Tradition, 128
 Anglo-German Arbitral Tribunal, 252
 An Issue in Jury Practice, 321
 An International Court of Appeal, 845
 Annuity Proposals, New, 576
 Appeals to Quarter Sessions, 467
 Appointment of Judges in Dependencies, 597
 Arbitration and Commercial Practices, 595
 Arrears in the High Court, 426
 Arrest of Mrs. Annan Bryce, 69
 Assessment of Damages by Police, 391
 Assignment of Part of a Debt, 252
 Assignments of Leaseholds by a Liquidator, 673
 Attachment as a Mode of Civil Execution, 844
 Attorney and Client in America, 821
 Auctioneers' Commission on the Sale of a Lease, 621
 Austen-Cartmell, the late Mr. James, 619
 Bacon, Lord, in Gray's Inn, 235
 Bacon's, Lord, "Idola," 127
 Balfour, Lord, of Burleigh, 707
 Bankruptcy Jurisdiction in the High Court, 836
 Bar in Trinidad, The, 487
 Barristers and the Lay Client, 71
 Bate, The late Dr. Pawley, 319

Current Topics (continued).

- Benevolent Construction of Wills, 805
 Birkenhead, Lord, on Provincial Divorce Trials, 166
 Birthday Honours, 619
 Black Books of Lincoln's Inn, 19
 Blackburn, Lord, 372
 Bonus Shares and Super-Tax, 812
 Bookmakers' Test Case, 145
 Branch Officers and the Income Tax, 746
 Bryce, Lord, on Anglo-American Ideals of Government, 672
 Bryce, Lord, on the Canadian Constitution, 789
 Business in Divorce, 594
 Business Premises Report, 182
 Business of the King's Bench Division, 843
 Cabinet of Inverness, 813
 Cambridge Law Journal, 690
 Cambridge Studies in English Legal History, 690
 Card Demonstrations in Court, 392
 Carson, Sir Edward, at the Bar, 544
 Casus Omissus in a Lease, 596
 Cause Célèbre of Urbain Grandier, 351
 Caveat Emptor, 637
 Certification of Lunatics, 574
 Challenging of Women Jurors, 215
 Charter of Nova Scotia, 828
 Chief Justice Marshall, 214
 Children's Courts, 127
 City of London Solicitors' Company, 303
 Civil Appeals in Criminal Causes, 545
 Civil Courts and a "State of War," 506
 Civil Judicial Statistics, 776
 Civil Service Bonus, 743
 Clearing Offices for Enemy Debts, 251
 Clifford's Inn, 19
 Close of the Long Vacation, 2
 Committee of Public Accounts and its Report, 20
 Comments on Pending Appeals, 168
 Committee on Solicitors' Remuneration, 671
 Compensation for Riot Damages, 391
 Compulsory or Voluntary Jurisdiction, 214
 Concurrent Sentences, 371
 Conditions attached to Discharge of a Bankrupt, 621
 Contemporary Criticism of the Code Napoleon, 575
 Continuance of D.O.R.A., 672
 Contracting out of the Rent Restriction Act, 304
 Conversion of Houses into Flats, 38, 594
 Copies of Documents in Divisional Court Appeals, 508
 Corpse Ways, 88
 Corroboration of Accomplices, 527
 Costs in Divorce, 761
 Council of the Law Society and the Law of Property Bill, 651
 Courtesy by Court Officials, 254
 Courts-Martial and the Irish King's Bench Division, 320
 Courts-Martial as Inferior Courts, 268
 Crimes Club, 183
 Criminal Law Amendment Bill, 777
 Criminal Statistics, 775
 Cumulative Effect of Minor Accidents, 107
 Customs of Normandy and of Paris, 487
 Dactylography, 690
 Darling, Mr. Justice, as a Poet, 371
 Decision of Questions of Law, 351
 Declaratory Orders in the Commercial Court, 745
 Defamatory Words concerning a Trade Union, 708
 Defamation by Advertisement, 182
 Defences not raised in Pleadings, 689
 Delivery of Particulars of Sales and Leases, 165
 Disraeli and the Bar, 283
 Distinction between Conditions and Warranties, 486
 Divorce Lists, 2, 233, 620
 Docking the Law Officers' Salaries, 253
 Domicile and Bankruptcy Jurisdiction, 812

Current Topics (continued).

D.O.R.A. Regulations, 811
 "Dual Capacity" of Government Officials, 20
 Duty to Mitigate Damages, 673
 Easter Cause Lists, 446
 Education and Unemployment Insurance, 335
 Education and the Liverpool Meeting, 2
 Emergency Powers Act, 37, 446, 525
 Emigrants of the Long Robe, 215
 Enforcement of Attendance for Instruction, 335
 English or Belgian Domicile, 285
 Erasmus and the Customs of England, 390, 411
 Essence of Defamation, 527
 Evans, the late Mr. Frank, 795
 Evidence in Capital Cases, 371
 Evidence of Character, 55
 Examination of the Devil of Torture, 351
 Exclusive and Exceptive Propositions, 427
 Execution of Foreign Judgments, 812
 Extenuating Circumstances, 836
 Extradition and the Fugitive Offenders Act, 335
 Failures of the Session (Bills), 796
 First Woman Agent in Scotland, 197
 Fleet Street and Westminster, 165
 Flexibility of Legal Phrases, 467
 Forfeiture of Annuities by Statute, 805
 Former Irish House of Lords, 305
 Freedom for Journalists, 53
 Freight Payable in Advance, 760
 Frivolous Criminal Appeals, 304
 Fusion Bill, 708
 Future of International Law, 593
 Future of the Final Appeal Court, 350
 Gambling and Mr. Serjeant Ballantyne, 55
 Games of Chance in Court, 55
 Gazelee, Mr. Mortimer, 39
 General Rulings of County Court Judges, 836
 German Indemnity, 370
 Gorell's, Lord, Matrimonial Causes Bill, 370
 Great Lawyer on Military Executions, 545
 Greenwood Murder Trial, 70
 Guardianship of Infants' Bill, 562
 Guilty but Insane, 168
 Habeas Corpus and the Restoration of Order (Ireland) Act, 744
 Hamilton as an Advocate, 321
 Head of the State as Foreign Minister, 252
 Hearing of Actions in the Long Vacation, 486
 Hearing of Incest Cases *in Camera*, 108
 High Court of Nova Scotia, 828
 Hilary Cause Lists, 213
 Hill, Sir Norman, on Officialism, 125
 Holograph Documents in Commerce, 38
 Hospitality of the Faculty of Advocates, 727
 House of Lords Legislative and Judicial, 349
 Hypnotism and the Investigation of Crime, 410
 Idola Theatri in Law, 107, 127
 Ilbert, Retirement of Sir Courtenay, 390
 Ilbert, Sir Courtenay, and the Society for Comparative Legislation, 425
 Illegality Founded on Public Policy, 371
 Immunity of Russian State Property, 728
 Imperial Peace Cabinet, 652
 Imperial School of Law, An, 596
 Imprisonment otherwise than for Crime, 844.
 Income Tax and Falling Profits, 506
 Income Tax Repayment, 788
 Increase of Bigamy, 776
 Increase of Rent Act, 108, 688
 Indemnity of a Betting Agent, 653
 Indian Divorces, 425, 446, 620
 Injunctions in Aid of Matrimony, 351

Current Topics (continued).

International Judges, 827
 International Law Conference, 812
 Interpretation and Enforcement of Agreements, 845.
 Intoxication as a Defence, 576
 Irving as a Criminologist, 183
 Judges and the Long Vacation, 671
 Judicial Committee and the Overseas Dominions, 126
 Judicial Salaries, 181, 573
 Jurisdiction in Revenue Cases, 836
 Jurisdiction to Pass a Postponed Sentence, 761
 Jury of Matrons, 183
 Jurymen in Historical Cases, 268
 Jurywomen in America, 411, 448
 Juvenile Courts (Metropolis) Bill, 106
 King's Bench Work in the Long Vacation, 687, 835
 Land-owning Titles in Nigeria, 729
 Land Union and the Law of Property Bill, 466
 Late Librarian of Lincoln's Inn, 54
 Law and the Ladies, 803
 Law Officers' Remuneration, 284
 Law of Property Bill, 166, 319, 333, 389, 409, 525, 543, 593
 743, 775, 787
 Law Society's Meeting, 19, 707, 819
 Lawyer as Politician, 564
 Lawyers and Doctors, 146
 Lawyers and Revolution, 269
 Lawyers in International Conference, 803
 Lawyers in Supreme Office, 234
 Legal Aspect of Reprisals, 53
 Legal Difficulties of Excess Profits Duty, 304
 Legal Position of Forwarding Agents, 761
 Legal Profession in Scotland, 745
 Legality of Whist Drives, 350
 Legislation by Reference, 333
 Legislation of the Session, 796
 Levy of Local Rates, 820
 Libel and Contempt, 390
 Liberty of the Press, 198
 Life Estates in Scots Law, 729
 Limitation of Liability, 797
 Lloyd-George, Mr., on State Interference with Solicitors, 86
 Locking-up of Juries, 268
 London Sessions and the Probation of Offenders, 488
 Longevity on the Bench, 147
 Long Vacation, 803
 Lord Chancellor, 37, 214, 486
 Lord Chancellor on Divorce Law, 620
 Lord Chancellor on Legal Reform, 181
 Lord Chief Justice, 759
 Lord Chief Justice on Mixed Juries, 167
 Lost Divorce Order, The, 446
 Macdonell, The late Sir John, 410
 Mackarness, The late Judge, 198
 Maitland, Professor, as a Jurist, 200
 Mandamus to a Public Department, 467
 Mandamus to pay a Rating Precept, 653
 Mandates under the League of Nations, 446
 Mansfield's Grand Refusal, 234
 Martial Law in Ireland, 166, 334, 350, 486, 506, 594
 Matrimonial Causes Bill, 466
 "May" and "Must," 54
 Meaning of Habitability, 594
 Meaning of a Plea of "Guilty," 467
 Members of Parliament and Income Tax Deductions, 620
 Mersey, Lord, in the Commercial Court, 426
 Mersey, Lord, Return to the Divorce Court, 466
 Michaelmas Cause Lists, 2, 843
 Military Courts in Ireland, 746, 760
 Milkmaids as Agricultural Servants, 575
 Ministry of Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, 86
 Ministry of Munitions and its Regulations, 20

Current Topics (continued).

Minor Improvements in Criminal Jurisprudence, 305
Mixed Juries, 167, 284
Modern Jurisdiction in Declaratory Orders, 746
Moratorium in Cuba, 20
More, Sir Thomas, as Speaker, 729
More's Place in English Legal History, 391
Moulton, Lord, 369, 426
Munificent Gift to the R.A.F. Memorial Fund, 412
Napoleon's Colleagues on the Code Napoleon, 561
National Association of Local Government Officers, 546
National Insurance Acts, 336
Native Law in our African Colonies, 796
Nature of a Penal Action, 487
Necessity for re-considering M'Naghten's Case, 147
New Chancellor of the Exchequer, 445
New Courts of Judicature in Ireland, 305
New Equity Appointments, 635
New Form of Trustee Security, 213
New High Court Judge, 505
New Lord Chief Justice, 465
New Lord Chief Justice of the United States, 688
New Lord of Appeal, 573
New Poor Persons Rules, 181, 198
New Protection and Dumping, 835
New Statutes, 198
Northcote, The late Mr. George Russell, 197
Nuisance by Noise, 146
Official Receiver as a *Persona Designata*, 507
Old Jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts, 507
Opinions of the Law Officers, 543
Overlooking Statutes, 370
Pleading the Statute, 526
Premiums and the Rent Restriction Act, 636
Prerogative of the King's Proctor, 637, 709
Preservation of Ancient Monuments Committee, 827
Priority of Execution Creditors & Bottomry Bondholders, 728
Privilege of Medical Witnesses, 689
Privilege of Solicitors in respect of Client's Communications, 689
Procedure of the Imperial Conference, 672
Public Trustee's Report, 744
Qualifications of the Judges, 827
Parliamentary Control over the Terms of Mandates, 447
Particulars Delivered Stamp, 544
Passing of Excess Profits Duty, 304
Patentable Changes in Known Articles, 350
Path of Reform in Children's Cases, 106
Patients and Panels, 215
Payment of Members, 563
Permanent Court of International Justice, 165, 214
Police and the Public, 821
Prætor to Proconsul, from 234
Presocious Lord Chancellor, 235
Premature Obituary Notices, 147
Prescriptive Claims to Judicial Office, 410
Presentation of a Cheque, 563
President on the Law of Property Bill, 1
Press conception of "Portia," 306
Presumption of Divorce, 321
Printers' Phthisis, 3
Professional Civil Servants' Journal, 485
Proof of Nationality, 467
Proposed Exemption of Women Jurors, 334
Proposed Special Tribunal, 182
Promotion from the Stipendiary Bench, 805
Provincial Meeting of the Law Society, 687
Provincial Trial of Divorce Cases, 126, 234, 267
Psycho-pathology in the Forum, 410
Railways Bill, 562
Reading's, Lord, Moratorium, 251
Reading, Lord, and Success at the Bar, 303
Repayment of Income Tax, 145

Current Topics (continued).

Registration as a Trade Mark of a word previously disclaimed, 106
Rent Restriction Cases, 253, 269, 336, 526, 546, 636, 688, 760
Rentoul, K.C., the late Commissioner on Honesty in Lawyers, 637
Rent Restriction and Rating, 744
Report on Civil Service Remuneration, 776
Reprisals in Peace, 105
Re-sale of Clifford's Inn, 270
Reprisals in War, 105
Restriction of Trial by Jury and other Provisions, 126
Remedies for Excessive Appeals, 305
Report on Ministers' Salaries, 284
Remedy by Mandamus, 820
Revenue Bill, 466, 486, 506
References to non-existent Authorities, 653
Right of Appeal as a Link of Empire, 126
Right to Dual Accommodation in Rent Restriction Cases, 796
Right to Privacy, 182
Right of Rejection in F.O.B. Contracts, 427
Romance of Conveyancing, 488
Rule in Shelley's Case, 320
Rule in *Dy v. Mayo*, 672
Rule in *Kimpson v. Markham*, 836
Russell, Lord, of Killowen, 87
Sale of the Doughty Estate, 39
Saturday Sittings, 574
Scarborough Meeting, 835, 843
Scope of the Probation Act, 447
Scots Faculty of Advocates, 745
Scottish and English Law, 727
Seizure of Ships by the Sheriff, 728
Semi-Private Executions, 199
Separation Orders, 370
Service on Agents for Foreign Principals, 125
Service of Nuns on Juries, 596
Shares with no Par Value, 636
Simple Contract Debts and the Statute of Limitations, 427
Simplification of Real Property Law, 466
Smuts, General, and the Imperial Conference, 728
Smuts, General, Theory of the British Constitution, 636
Soldier's Plea of Superior Orders, A, 620
Solicitors and Confidential Communications, 813
Solicitors in Victorian Fiction, 39
Solicitors' Remuneration, 844
Statelessness, 844
Status of Demobilised Men, 146
Statutory Jurisdiction of the Consistory Court, 507
Stringer, Mr. F. A., Retirement of, 233
Sub-letting of Part of Premises, 575
Subpœna of the Defendant, 487
Sub-Tenants and the Rent Restriction, 236
Suicide as an Accident, 710
Super-Tax and Bonus Shares, 621
Super-Tax and Deductions for Personal Allowance and for Children, 505
Supplies of Munitions to Belligerents, 788
Supreme Court Officers Bill, 788
Success in Advocacy, 653
System of Law in British Possessions, 596
Taft, Ex-President, 804
Taxation not a Legal Necessary, 797
Teaching of Jurisprudence, 789
Technical Meaning of Condonation, 235
Technical Meaning of "Extenuating Circumstances," 447
Telephone Charges, 235
Temple Bar, 411
Tenancy by Novation under Rent Restriction Act, 595
Tenure of Government Appointments, 252
Termination of the War, 760, 787, 811
Test of Domicile, 285

Current Topics (continued).

Thirty-three years a Magistrate, 805
Title to Confiscated Goods, 561
Total Losses and the Rate of Exchange, 507
Trade Unions—a New Departure, 426
Trade Unions and Profit Sharing Schemes, 636
Treaties and Private Property, 526
Trials on Good Friday, 527
Trinity Sittings, 574
Trustee Securities and Private Bills, 85
Twentieth Century Style Book, 267
Turkey and the Termination of the War, 820
Uncertain Expression of a Contract, 38
Undermanned Divisional Courts, 595
United Law Clerks Society, 485
United States Supreme Court, 214
Unreadiness in the Divorce Court, 574
Unreasonable withholding of Consent to Assignment, 828
Use of Patented Inventions by Government Departments, 38
Vacant Lord Chief Justiceship, 445
Vacation Rules, 759
Validity of Hypnotic Confessions, 351
Verdict of "Not Guilty," 508
Vesting of Settled Chattels, 804
Viceroyalty of Lord Reading, 283
Wainwright, Henry, and the late Mr. W. S. Gilbert, 199
Wallas, Professor Graham, as a Critic of Lawyers, 652
War Bonus and Pensions, 788
War Decrease in Non-Indictable Offences, 776
West Indian Court of Appeal, 845
Women and Hearsay Evidence, 254
Women Jurors Rules, 106
Women on Juries, 253
Wrongful Conspiracy and Unlawful Threats, 708
Will Making by Reference, 804
Yorkshire's Welcome to the Law Society, 819

IN PARLIAMENT.

In Parliament, 345, 360, 380, 398, 417, 436, 457, 476, 494,
515, 535, 555, 568, 608, 628, 643, 682, 715, 737, 754,
769, 784, 793, 800

LEADING ARTICLES.

Act of State, 711
Agriculture Act, 1920 ; 306, 323, 338, 353, 373, 393, 429
Application for the Prolongation of a Patent on the ground
of War Loss, 168
Bankrupt Tenants and the Rent Restriction Act, 790
Belloc's, Mr., Theory of the British Constitution, 394
Cabinet and the Constitution, 430
Challenging of Jurors, 322
Change from Personal Representative to Trustee, 710
Citation of Reports, 413
Civil Jurisdiction over Courts Martial, 336
Clark, The late Mr. James W. (K.C.), 746
Codes of Napoleon, 546
Codification of Municipal Laws, 238
Codified Criminal Law, 57
Colliers and the History of Villeinage in Scotland, 470
Conduct increasing the Perils of an Employment, 129
Constitution of the United States, 288
Constitutional Control of Public Expenditure, 147
Constitutional Doctrine of *De tallagio non concedendo*, 654
County Court Staff Committee's Report, 184, 201
Covenants in Restraint of Trade and Solicitors, 622
Creation of Restrictive Covenants, 271
Curiosities of Pleading, 625
Death Duties and Settled Legacies, 655
Declaratory Orders in the County Court, 565
Discharge of a Jury in course of Trial, 183
Domicile of Origin and the *Animus Revertendi*, 690
Dropping of the Revenue Bill, 528
Effect of Public Policy on the Legality of Contracts, 307
Emergency Proclamations and the "State of Siege," 468
Enforceability of Subscriptions to Charities, 837

Leading Articles (continued).

Eviction by Title Paramount, 548
Famous Trial of Old Days, 578
Forfeiture and Words of Futurity, 110
Founder of English Jurisprudence, 656
French Decision on the Rate of Exchange, 693
Gifts to Spiritual Advisers, 392
Gorell, Lord, 150
Illegality of Fortune Telling, 509
Inconsistent and Alternative Convictions, 287
International Disputes in Practice, 255
International Law Conference, 822
Judicial Veto in the United States, 131
Jurisdiction of Gaol Delivery, 200
Land, Money or Both, 41
Law of Property Bill, 488, 576, 598, 638, 675, 692
Lawyers and the Professional Spirit, 847
League of Nations Assembly, 88
Legal Education in the United States, 838
Legal Status of the Food Controller, 747, 763, 778
Legality of Knock-out Sales, 254
Liability of Railway Companies for Lost Luggage, 449
Licence to Commit a Nuisance, 639
Limits of Matrimonial Agency, 55
Limits of the Trade Union Domestic Forum, 674
Lord Chief Justice of England, 490
Lunacy Office, 789
Memorandum on the Law of Property Bill, 564
Mercatores in Magna Carta, 640
Military Courts in Ireland, 777
Mortgages under the Peace Treaty with Germany, 354
Mr. Balfour Browne, K.C., the late, 846
Napoleon as Lawgiver, 549
New Light on the Origin of Parliament, 600
New Orientation of Martial Law Theory, 352
New Part I of the Law of Property Bill, 412
New West Indian Court of Appeal, 308
Nineteenth Amendment, 22
Novus Actus Interveniens, 71
Nullification of Judgments and the Indemnity Act, 1920 ; 597
Origin of Trade Unions, 39, 374, 510, 731, 763, 779
Poor Persons' Cases and Solicitors, 128
Position of a Trustee, 797
Postliminium in International Law, 324
Powers of Expulsion from Private Bodies, 813
Prescriptive Claims to Legal Office, 372
President's Address, 845
Proof and the English Law of Evidence, 89
Proper Consideration for a Sale under the Settled Land Acts, 286
Proportional Representation, 566
Protection of Purchasers, 508
Psycho-Analysis in the Courts, 414
Queen Victoria's place in English Constitutional History, 529
Reading, Lord : an Appreciation, 236
Recent Decisions on the Law of Vendor and Purchaser, 448,
469, 489
Recent Opinions of the Council of the Law Society, 22, 849
Recovery of Damages for Loss of a Deceased Child, 623
Report of the Merchandise Marks Committee, 21
Reputed Ownership and Bill of Sale, 805
Requisitioning of Land and the Prerogative, 112
Roll of Honour at Scotland Yard, 450
Sale of Food Order, 1921 ; 814
Secret Testamentary Trusts, 828
Sharpe, The late Mr. William A., 90
Smuts' General Theory of the British Constitution, 170, 185,
202, 216, 237
Solicitors' Mutual Trustee Society, 3
Status originating out of Contract, 108
Statutory Powers of the Ministry of Transport, 427
Successful Action by Foreigner to protect his Reputation
and Sales here, 216
Supreme Court Officers' Bill, 761

Leading Articles (continued).

- Survival of Penal Actions, 529
- Symbolic Delivery of Possession, 577
- Tax on Turnover, 151
- Tenant's Right to Remove Fixtures, 149
- Tenure of Office under the Crown, 169
- Trial by Jury, 270
- Two Forgotten Jurists: Machiavelli and Montesquieu, 798
- Vocation of a Solicitor, 4
- Waiver by Statutory Acceptance of Rent, 821
- Waiver of Notice to Quit, 730
- War Risks and Marine Risks, 40

MAGISTRATES' CHRONICLE.

- Criminal Liability of the Hundred, 659
- Meaning of Criminal Appeal, 677
- Mens Rea* in Statutory Offences, 749
- Magisterial and Local Government Decisions*—
- Arrest for the Protection of an Innocent Person, 750
- Beerhouses and Hypothetical Tenants, 678
- Compensation and Previous Offers, 749
- Conversion of Houses into Flats, 660
- Frontager's Liability to make up Roads, 678
- Implied Repeal of Special Act by General Act, 659
- Issue of a Licence to a Substituted Person, 659
- Meaning of "Public Ceremony," 659
- Overlapping of Offences, 750
- Sewer made for Private Profit, 660
- Statutory Indemnities and the Public Authorities Acts, 678

Scintilla Juris—

- Codification of Summary Jurisdiction Law, 750
- Fair Play in Separation Order Cases, 750
- Forcible Entry, 741
- Justices of the Peace, 678
- Juvenile Offenders, 660
- Rating of Piers, 660
- Soke of Peterborough, 678
- Termination of the Jurisdiction of Munition Tribunals, 750
- Unlawful Threats, 660

MISCELLANEOUS.

- Agriculture (Amendment) Bill, 420
- Anglo-German Mixed Tribunal, 277
- A Novel War Memorial, 522
- Appeal against Court Martial Sentence, 263
- Auctioneer's Right to Commission, 630
- Barbers and Surgeons, 101
- Belgian Bar and English Solicitors, 701
- Belt Case, 150
- Bonus Shares, 807
- Canadian Liquor Laws, 278
- Child's Right in the Roadway, 630
- City Coroner's Office, 583
- City Coroner's Work during 1920; 439
- Closing of Contentious Prize Work, 243
- Collusive Divorce, 538
- Compensation for Government Workmen, 243
- Compulsory Pilotage, 297
- Conversion of Houses into Flats, 500
- Corpse Ways, 16, 100
- Council of Magistrates, 558
- County Court Staff Committee's Report, 208
- Court of Justice of the League, 121
- Customary Quarter day in Bristol, 32
- Dementia Præcox* in the New Criminology; 816
- Dispersal of Estates, 176
- Disposals Board Case, 32
- Divorce at Assizes, 277
- Divorce Causes not ready for Trial, 584
- Divorce Court Perjury, 48
- Divorce Court Practice, 613
- Divorcee in New Zealand, 684

Miscellaneous (continued).

- Divorce Law Reform, 160
- Dry New York, 500
- Early Imprisonment and Habitual Criminals, 832
- Escheat of Enfranchised Copyholds, 645
- Excess Rent Claim, 208, 225
- Extracts from the Law of Property Bill, 400
- Finlay, Lord, on Legal Education, 419
- General List of Petitions for Private Bills, Session 1921; 224
- Gentlemen of the Jury, 263
- Germany and the League, 141
- Gifts to the National Trust, 278, 297
- Goods lost in Post, 193
- "Guilty" or "Not Guilty," 773
- High Court Jurisdiction over Scotsmen, 243
- Historic Thames-side Site for Sale, 328
- Housing and Town Planning Act, 99, 500
- Increase of M.P.'s Salaries, 48
- Indian Students in Great Britain, 785
- Inns of Court Mission Memorial, 723
- Italian Capital Tax, 583
- Judges at the Mansion House, 684
- Judicial Veto in the United States, 131
- Juvenile Courts and the Conviction of Children, 192
- Juvenile Courts Bill, 100
- Juvenile Offender, 538
- Law of Property Bill, 499
- Legacy Duty, 724
- Linthorne, Sir R., O.B.E., Dinner to, 419
- Lord Mayor at the Law Courts, 78
- Magistrate on Tenants' Conduct, 225
- Married Women and Voluntary Separation Agreements, 499
- Members of Parliament and Income Tax Deductions, 630
- Memorandum as to Order IX, Rule 8A, 131
- Mixed Arbitral Tribunals, 631
- Nationality of Children born Abroad of British Parents, 840
- New Auction Mart, 522
- New Bank Fusion, 315
- New Sessions House Opened, 243
- New Undersheriff of the City, 839
- New Zealand Law Firm, An Old, 297
- Nugae ex Legibus*, 118
- Ordnance Map Copyright, 405
- Parker, Lord, the Late, and King's College, Cambridge, 832
- Perjury in Chancery Proceedings, 724
- Postponement of Cases, 613
- Practice in Restitution Suits, 120
- Premiums and the Rent Restrictions Act, 277
- Presentations at the Law Courts, 773
- Preservation of Footpaths, 500
- Probation Act, 458
- Probation Officers, 121
- Procedure Reform, 119
- Psycho-Analysis and Improvement of the Criminal Law, 824
- Reading, Lord, Appointment as Viceroy, 242
- Reading, Lord, Farewell Dinner to, 399
- Reading, Lord, on the League of Nations, 296
- Report of the Select Committee on Business Premises, 192
- Revenue Bill, 1921; 491
- Roman Law and the Northern Nations, 723
- Rotation of Crops, 539
- Scottish Treasure Trove of the Fifteenth Century, 569
- Secret Incest Trials, 120
- Solicitor and Affidavit, 405
- Solicitor's Fraud, 48
- Stringer, Mr. F. A., Presentation to, 242
- Super-Tax; Is it payable on the Personal Allowance? 521
- Tax on Turnover, 151
- Termination of the War, 193
- Thurtell Trial, 263
- Trade Union's Action for Slander, 723

Miscellaneous (continued).

- "Unjustifiable delay" in Prosecution, 161
- Westminster City Council and Building, 857
- Woman Judge in Murder Case, 277
- World Arbitration, 741

OBITUARY.

- Atkinson, Mr. Charles Milner, 177
- Austen-Cartmell, Mr. James, 614
- Baker, Mr. William, 121
- Ball, Mr. Alfred John Morton, 329
- Bate, Dr. Pawley, 329
- Browne, Mr. Balfour, K.C., 841
- Bulcraig, Mr. Henry, 226
- Buszard, Mr. M. C., K.C., 832
- Clark, Mr. James W., K.C., 746
- Dalton, Sir Cornelius, 49
- Digby, Mr. John, 193
- Dixon, Mr. S. B., 458
- Dugdale, Mr. J. Stratford, K.C., 64
- Etheridge, Mr. A. F., 101
- Fry, The Right Hon. Lewis, 832
- Goode, Mr. John, 383
- Goodman, Sir Gerald, 278
- Greenhow, Judge William Thomas, 539
- Hannam-Clark, Mr. Frederick, 584
- Ince, Mr. Francis, 161
- Jones, The Right Hon. Sir David Brynmor, K.C., 785
- Knox, Mr. E. F. Vesey, K.C., 569
- Law, Sir Archibald, 773
- Lloyd, Sir Horatio, 209
- Mackarness, Judge Frederic, 209
- Macklin, His Honour Judge, 801
- Macnaghton, Sir Melville Leslie, Kt., C.B., 569
- Moulton, Lord, 419
- Phillips, Mr. Arthur, 226
- Roberts, Mr. Arthur Rhys, 142
- Robinson, Mr. James, 841
- Sharpe, Mr. William A., 90
- Sifton, Mr. A. L., 278
- Smyly, Mr. William Cecil, K.C., 405
- Terrington, Lord, 315
- Walker, Mr. Frederick, 420
- Wurtzburg, Mr. E. A., 857
- Zeffertt, Mr. Charles N. S., 539

RES JUDICATÆ.

- Abatement by Death, 431
- Accord and Satisfaction, 5, 431
- Accretions from the Sea, 151
- Acquisition of Domicile by Married Women, 626
- Action in Name of a Dead Man, 171
- Actions by Mixed Firms of Alien Amis and Alien Enemies, 799
- Acts of a Magistrate when *Functus Officio*, 113
- Actual, Forcible and Violent Entry, 171
- Agreement to Live Apart, 641
- Anticipatory Breach, 58
- Assignment of part of a Debt, 579
- Authority to Brief Counsel, 59
- Bankers' Lien, 256
- Bequests to Children who pre-decease the Testator leaving issue, 791
- Breach of Statutory Trusts, 151
- Breach of Warranty in a Charter-party, 601
- Burden of Proving Short Delivery, 765
- Calculation of a Workman's Wage, 712
- Carrier's Defence of Defective Packing, 510
- Carrying on of Business, 91
- Champertous Agreement to Collect Betting Debts, 132
- Company's Liability on Bills of Exchange, 289
- Computation of Increases in Weekly Rent, 642
- Computation of Time in Divorce, 203
- Confiscation of Enemy Merchant Ships, 732

Res Judicata (continued).

- Conflicting Statutes of Limitation, 799
- Contracting Out of a Statute, 113
- Contractual Rights and the Indemnity Act, 1820, 748
- Convictions on Mere Admissions, 112
- Corroboration in Bastardy Cases, 288
- Costs of Abortive Appeals, 91
- Costs of Working out Directions of Order, 491
- Court Emergency Powers, 24
- Covenants in Leases, 272
- Criminal Cause or Matter, 91
- Cy Pres* Doctrine, 531
- Damages and the Rate of Exchange, 58
- Declaration of Shipment without Undue Delay, 765
- Declaratory Actions concerning D.O.R.A., 431
- Departures from Statutory Form, 132
- Dependent relative revocation of Wills, 694
- Determination of Bailments, 625
- Devise of House for Personal Occupation, 273
- "Die without having been Married," 694
- Disciplinary Powers of Private Meeting, 530
- Distinction between Expounding and Amending an Award, 799
- Disturbance of a Market, 658
- Doctrine of Respondent Superior, 676
- Election by Signing Final Judgment, 151
- Election to Abide by Order, 579
- Election to Affirm a Contract of Sale, 491
- Enemy Ships in Neutral Waters, 712
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments for Alimony, 676
- Evidence (Further Amendment) Act, 1869 ; 748
- Express Affirmative and Implied Negative Covenants, 550
- Final Awards in Arbitration, 325
- Forcible Entry, 72
- Forfeiture of Enemy Private Property, 694
- "Free from Income Tax," 791
- Frustration of Contract, 765
- General Average under the York-Antwerp Rules, 748
- Goods Lost in *Transitu*, 510
- Goods Sold by Description, 808
- Illegality of an English Contract in a Foreign Country, 549
- Illegality of Contract, 808
- Injunctions relating to Personal Services, 272
- Interest in a Public Contract, 238
- Interpretation of Warranty, 73
- Invalidity of Attachment Order, 24
- Investments of Building Societies, 132
- Irrevocability of Waiver, 324
- Legal Misconduct of an Arbitrator, 452
- Liability of Carriers, 6
- Limitation of Liability in Tort and Contract, 601
- Limitation of Right of Occupation, 324
- Limited Naturalization, 91
- Maintenance and Champerty, 23
- Malice and the Public Authorities Act, 1893 ; 171
- Mandamus for Breach of a Statutory Duty, 203
- Marine Insurance and Contracts of Indemnity, 641
- Meaning of the term "Document," 452
- Measure of Damages, 58
- Measure of Damages in Hiring Contracts, 657
- Merger in Marine Insurance, 73
- Mineral Working and Subsidence, 712
- Month in a Contract, whether Lunar or Calendar, 186
- Negligence by Banker, 257
- Negligence in Exercise of a Statutory Duty, 203
- Non-disclosure in a Marine Insurance Policy, 289
- Notice of Assignment, 471
- Nullum Tempus occurrit regi*, 238
- Period of Limitation in Administration Actions, 340
- Pleading in Ejectment Actions, 218
- Points in Restitution Practice, 186
- Position of co-Defendants, 732
- Power to Expel Shareholders, 340

Res Judicatae (continued).

- Proceeds of a Fraudulent Cheque, 471
- Professional Training of Justices, 676
- Proof of Means to Pay Instalments of Judgment Debt, 658
- Railway Companies as Common Carriers, 764
- "Reasonable Care" and "Reasonable Skill": The Distinction between, 238.
- Reasonableness of Conditions in a Commercial Contract, 511
- Registration of Business Names, 491
- Repudiation of Contract illegal in a Foreign Country, 550
- Right to Assign Lease, 676
- Right of Rejection of Goods Sold, 289
- Seizure of Salary in Bankruptcy, 23
- Setting Down of Appeals for Hearing, 452
- Statutory Assignment of a Debt, 808
- Statutory Meaning of "Customer," 257
- Staying of Petitions of Right, 471
- Supersession of Courts by Statute, 73
- Taking Advantage of one's own Default, 732
- Tender of a Broker's Cover Note, 58
- Trade Fixtures and Fixtures *in situ*, 218
- Unstamped Deeds of Arrangement, 808
- Validity of D.O.R.A., Regulation 2n, 601
- Valuable Consideration, 5
- Vesting in Bankruptcy of a Right to Damages, 5
- Volenti non fit Injuria*, 732
- Waiver expressly declared not to be such, 218
- Waiver of Breach by Acceptance of Rent, 626
- Waiver of Irregularities in Procedure, 657
- Warranty of Fitness on Sale of Chattels, 113
- Wife's Costs and the "Usual Order," 748
- Winding-up of Enemy Estates, 579
- Wrongful Conversion by Forced Sale of Goods, 530

REVIEWS.

- Annual Practice, 92., 848
- Bankruptcy Law, 602
- Benjamin on Sale, by W. C. Alan Ker, M.A., 415
- Charitable Bequests, 830
- Clemson's Methods and Machinery of Business, 355
- Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence, by A. E. Randall, 42
- Commercial Law, "Scrutton's," 452
- Common Law of England, by W. Blake Odgers, M.A., 187
- Company Law, 114, 132, 151, 355, 452
- Contracts, 681
- Conveyancing, Notes on Perusing Titles, by L. E. Emmet, 751
- County Court Practice, 308, 340
- Divorce Law, 602
- Ecclesiastical Law, 471, 830
- Egyptian Law of Obligations, by Prof. F. P. Walton, 6
- Elements of Conveyancing for Students, 113
- English and Empire Digest, 257
- Evidence, 432, 603, 780
- Excess Profits Duty, 204, 289
- Finance Acts, 471
- Goodwill, 712
- Gorell, Lord, A Memoir, by J. E. G. De Montmorency, 150
- Hazell's Almanack for 1921, 375
- Heywood and Massey's Lunacy Practice, 133
- Income Tax, 273, 511
- Jones' Solicitors Forms, 308
- Insurance, The Laws of, 432
- International Law, 602, 732
- Interpretation of Statutes, by W. Wyatt Paine, 6
- Investments, 309
- Landlord and Tenant, 309, 626
- Law and Practice of Rating, by W. C. Ryde, K.C., 114
- Legal Diaries, 187, 218
- Marine Insurance, 511
- Maritime Law, by A. Saunders, 6
- Mews' Digest, 375, 751
- Law of Torts, 531

Reviews (continued).

- Law of Transport by Railway, 355
- Local Government Law, 511, 602
- Magisterial Law, 550
- Notable Trials, 171, 491
- Patents, 432
- Principles of Equity, by A. M. Wilshire, M.A., 113
- Principles of the Law of Real Property, by T. Cyprian Williams, LL.B., 257
- Real Property Law, 603
- Receivers, 452
- Rent Restriction Act, 1920; 694
- Selected Cases illustrating the Law of Contracts, 289
- Specific Performance of Contracts, A Treatise on the, 325
- Stamp Laws, 452
- Statute Law, 713
- Story of Newfoundland, by Lord Birkenhead, 258
- Williams on Executors, 550
- Year Books (Selden Society), 829

SOCIETIES AND COMPANIES.

- Alliance Assurance Company, 613
- Bar Council, 262, 328
- Barristers' Benevolent Association, 478, 519
- Berks, Bucks & Oxfordshire Law Society, 683
- Birmingham Law Society, 383
- Bristol Law Society, 62
- Britannic Assurance Co., Ltd., 418
- Chester and N. Wales Law Society, 364
- City of London Solicitors Company, 313, 520
- Council of Legal Education, 582
- Equity and Law Life Assurance Society, 400
- Gray's Inn, 117, 276, 630
- Gray's Inn Moot Society, 96, 117, 498, 583, 612
- Grotius Society, 610
- Halifax Law Society, 478
- Hardwicke Society, 740
- Incorporated Accountants, 224, 538, 740, 857
- Incorporated Justices' Clerks' Society, 739
- Inner Temple, 117
- Inns of Court O.T.C., 118
- International Law Association, 801
- Law Association, 612
- Law Guarantee & Accident Co., Ltd., 500
- Law Society, 8, 29, 46, 62, 76, 96, 262, 293, 381, 664, 700, 717, 825, 839, 849
- Law Students' Journal, 49, 64, 79, 101, 161, 177, 278, 328, 439, 500, 701, 840, 857
- Legal & General Assurance Society, Ltd., 263
- Lincoln's Inn, 96, 399
- Liverpool Law Society, 139, 159, 176
- London County Westminster & Parr's Bank, 244
- London Guarantee & Accident Company, Ltd., 478
- London Joint City & Midland Bank, 226, 297
- Middle Temple, 96, 276, 399
- Oxford University Moot Club, 142
- National Provincial and Union Bank of England, Ltd., 329, 569
- Newcastle-upon-Tyne Law Society, 262
- Selden Society, 398
- Sheffield Law Society, 418, 437
- Society of Comparative Legislation, 630
- Society of Public Teachers of Law, 722
- Solicitors' Benevolent Association, 31, 856
- Solicitors' Law Stationery Society, Ltd., 244, 522
- Sussex Law Society, 477
- United Law Clerks Society, 497
- United Law Society, 32, 78, 118, 277

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

- An Epitome of Recent Decisions on, 273, 290, 309, 356, 375, 395

INDEX TO NEW RULES, ORDERS, &c.

ARMY COUNCIL.

Arms, Ammunition and Military Explosives, 45
Army Council, 175
Merchant Shipping (Convention), 175

BOARD OF TRADE.

Aliens and Key Industries, 519
Anglo-German Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, 138
Business Names, 738
Coal (Bunkering and Export), 138, 241
Coal (Emergency) Supplementary, 496, 538, 557.
Ex-Enemy Patents and Copyrights, 138
Food Control, 817
German Reparation Recovery, 496, 519, 538, 556, 610
Liquor Control, 157, 519
Local Authorities (Gas and Coal) (Scotland), 28
Mining Industry Act, 157
Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, 849
New Dry Regulation, 817
Patents of German Austrian Vested in Custodian, 519
Patents of German Nationals Vested in Custodian, 519
Poisons and Pharmacy Regulations, 28
Pre-War German Debt Claims, 223
Rights and Interests of German Nationals in Public Utility
Undertakings or Concessions in Certain Countries, 362
Rule under the Assurance Companies, 557
Treaties of Peace (Copyright), 190
War Compensation Court, 817
Water—Gas (Emergency), 557
Wireless Telegraphy, 817

FOOD ORDERS.

Apple (Prices), 158
Bacon, Ham and Lard (Sales) No. 2, 1920, 26, 223, 312, 328
Butter, 46
Canned Salmon (Prices), 28
Eggs (Description of Sale), 261
Flour and Bread, 46
Flour (Emergency Returns), 497
Food Hoarding, 46, 497
Forms and Documents (Interpretation), 538
Fresh Water Fish, 437
Hops (Prohibition of Import), 208
Jam (Sales), 27
Milk, 496, 755
Potatoes, 158
Revocations, 139, 175, 191, 241, 328, 437, 518, 737, 772, 809
Road Transport (Requisition), 477
Stocks of Food (Returns), 518

HOME OFFICE ORDERS.

Dangerous Drugs, 241, 582
Firearms and Ammunitions, 347
Licensing Rules, 831

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE.

Cultivation of Lands (Temporary Provisions), 363
New Basis for the Redemption of Tithe Rent-charge, 223

MINISTRY OF HEALTH.

General Housing Memorandum, No. 37, 28
Local Government Emergency Provisions (Temporary Continuance), 809

Parliamentary Register, 138
Representation of the People Acts, 45

MINISTRY OF LABOUR.

Unemployment Insurance, 138, 223, 241, 519, 582, 772

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT.

Rates Advisory Committee, 223, 610, 629, 839

MISCELLANEOUS.

Anglo-German Arbitral Tribunal, 261
Colonial Office (Maintenance), 737, 817
Compensation for War Damage, 800
County of London Quarter Sessions, 261
Delay in Trials, 800
Foreign Office Order, Termination of Treaty, 839
German Debts under the Peace Treaty, 800
Local Government of Greater London, 801
London County Council,
Memorandum as to Order IX, Rule 8A, Rules of Supreme Court, 131
Public Trustee's Office, 293
Revenue Bill, 491
Royal Commission Fire Losses, 262
Stamps at the Law Courts, 457
Treasury Order, Compulsory Hiring of Houses (Scotland), 582

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Abolition of List "C," 610
Amendments of the Aliens Order, 157
Bedfordshire County Court, 45
Census Order, 223
Coal (Emergency) Directions, 517
County Court Districts, 629
Inland Revenue, Repayment of Income Tax, 157
Judicial Committee Fees, 517
Marriage of British Subjects (Facilities), 45
Mining Industry (Transfer of Powers and Property), 157
Ministry of Food (Cessation), 609
Ministry of Health (Transfer of Powers) as to Gas Undertakings, 137
Ministry of Munitions (Cessation), 609
Ministry of Shipping (Cessation), 609
Notices, Miscellaneous, 327, 629
Parliamentary Register, 137
Parliament of Northern Ireland (Disqualifications Removal), 629
Prohibition of Importation of Firearms and of Munitions of War, 477
Revocation of the Defence of the Realm Regulations, 477, 517
Sea-Fishing Indentures of Apprenticeship, 517
Somerset Assizes, 137
Supreme Court, Gibraltar (Admiralty Jurisdiction), 137
Termination of the War, 793
Trading with the Enemy (Custodian Direction), 808
Treaty of Peace, 276, 362

PROCLAMATIONS.

Coal Crisis Proclamation, 457, 538, 609
Prohibition of Exportation of Gold and Silver Coin and Gold Bullion, 312
Reserves, 477

NEW RULES, ORDERS, &c.

COLONIAL STOCK, 362, 770
 COMMISSIONERS FOR OATHS (FEES), 556
 COMPANIES (WINDING-UP), 809
 COUNTY COURT (FEES), 629
 COUNTY COURT (PROCEDURE), 207, 536
 GRANTING PROBATE TO CORPORATIONS, 477
 JUVENILE COURTS, 644
 KING'S BENCH DIVISION SITTINGS IN OCTOBER, 1921,
 700
 LANCASTER CHANCERY COURT, 644
 LONG VACATION, 755
 LUNACY RULES, 556

SHERIFF ENGLAND POUNDAGE AND FEES, 581
 SUPREME COURT (BANKRUPTCY JURISDICTION), 839
 SUPREME COURT (COSTS), 495
 SUPREME COURT (FUNDS), 221, 241, 476
 SUPREME COURT (GERMAN REPARATION) (RECOVERY),
 456, 849
 SUPREME COURT (INDEMNITY), 517
 SUPREME COURT (NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE), 495
 SUPREME COURT (PROCEDURE), 205, 222, 496, 697,
 738, 755, 771
 SUPREME COURT (RULES No. 2), 770, 839
 SUPREME COURT (UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE), 516

Names of Cases Reported.

Adams v London Improved Motor Coach Builders	154	Debtor, A. No. 206 of 1920, Re ..	219	Ideal Film Renting Co v Nielsen ..	379
Ainsworth, Re.	680	Dennis v Midland Rly	511	Inland Revenue v Blott	642
Aksionairnoye Obschestvo Luther v Sagar & Co	604	Deutsche Bank, Re	492	Jacques v Steam Tug "Alexandra" ..	752
"Alexander Shukoff" v "Gothland" ..	152	Deutsche Bank, Re No. 2	781	Jenkin v Pharmaceutical Soc	116
Archibald Russell, Lim v Corser ..	239	Dickson's Settled Estates, Re ..	532	Jerrey & Co v Bamford	580
Ashton, Re	44	Dr. Barnardo's Homes v Income Tax Comms	433	Jeynes v Hindle	397
Att-Gen v Cotton Powder Co	714	Drake, Re	553	Joachimson v Swiss Bank	434
Att-Gen v Fulham Corp	174	Ellis' Settlement, Re	153	Joel v International Circus and Fair	293
Att-Gen v Wilts United Dairies ..	752	Erskine Macdonald, Lim v Eyles ..	275	Johnston v Manzi-Fe	607
Attwood v Lamont	25	Evans v Brunner Mond & Co	131	Johnstone v Maconochie	43
Backhouse, Re	580	Evans' Will Trusts, Re	753	Johnstone v Pedlar	679
Baker v Dalglish Shipping Co	754	Everett v Griffiths	395	Kentish v Snaith	455
Banque Belge v Hambrouck	74	Farrow's Bank, Re	679	Keyes v Keyes	435
Barton & Mitchell v Fincham	326	Ferdinand, ex-Tzar of Bulgaria, Re ..	7	Korvine, Re	205
Batty v Vincent	311	Fettes v Robertson	433	Kutner, Re	604
Bebington v Wildman	343	Fife Coal Co v Cant	204	Leavis v Leavis	456
Blum, In the estate of	136	Fife Coal Co v Sharp	239	Levinstein v Levinstein	767
Blundell-Leigh v Attenborough ..	474	Fitch v Dewes	626	Lewcock v Bromley	75
Borre, The	715	Flower v Lyme Regis Corp	133	Lingley v Firth & Sons	172
Bostock, Re	221	French v Gething	696	Lipton v Powell	275
Bowler v Lovegrove	397	Georges, Re	311	Lucas v Reubens	492
Bradbury v Grimble & Co	61	Gibaud v G E Rly	454	Lucas-Tooth v Lucas-Tooth	377
Braithwaite v Society of Carpenters ..	661	Gibson v Gibson	175	Macartney, Re	435
British and Foreign Ins Co v Gaunt ..	551	Gisborough's Settled Estates, Re ..	553	Macclesfield Corp v Macclesfield Grammar School	663
British & Foreign Marine Ins Co v Wilson	25	Gittus v Inland Revenue Comms ..	512	Maskell v Hill	714
Brough v Nettleton	515	Glebe Sugar Co v Port of Greenock ..	551	Mayo v Stazicker	380
Burrell v Selvaige	734	Glossop v Ashley	695	Metropolitan Rly v Delaney	453
Caldwell v Caldwell	765	Gordon-Smith v Peizer	607	Meyrick, Re	155
Calmenson v Merchants Warehousing Co	341	Gossage, In the Estate of	274	Michelham, Re	568
Cape Brandy Syn v Inland Revenue ..	377	Gould & Co v Houghton	344	Millett v Van Heck & Co	356
Chalmers, Re	475	Great Central Rly v Bates	768	"Mogileff," The	581
Chiverton v Ede	260	Gunston v Winox	310	Moore & Co v Donnelly	219
City of Edinburgh, The	221	Hamilton, Re	173	Moriarty v Regents Garage Co ..	474
Claridge's Asphalt Co, Re	455	Hammerstone v Leary	606	Morris, Re	95
Clifford and O'Sullivan, Re	792	Hansford v Jago	188	Mountain v Whittle	415
Consett Industrial Soc v Consett Iron Co	533	Harcourt, Re	766	Murray v Dalton	155
Conyngham, Re	342	Harmer v Jumbil Tin Areas	93	National Cash Register Co v Stanley ..	643
Coope v Ridout	114	Harrison v Holland, &c	736	Neville v Hardy	135
Crane v Director of Public Prosecu- tions	642	Haydock v Goodier	416	Nicholls, Re	533
Crocker v Crocker	153	Hewett, Re	116	Nicholson v Jackson	713
Cuban Land and Development Co ..	680	Hinckes, Re	291	Nicoll, Re	8
"Danube II," The	396	Hinckes v Harris	781	North Metropolitan Electric Power Co v Stoke Newington	240
Davenport v Smith	767	Holden v Southwark Corp	475	Palmer v Palmer	736
Davidson's Patents, Re	74	Holford v Trim	768	Peck's Settlement, Re	735
Davies v Powell Duffryn Coal Co ..	567	Hollis Stores v Timmis	735	Peck's Contract, Re	220
		Holt, Re	293	Peel's Release, Re	580
		Hudston v Viney	59	Percival v Peterborough Corp	60
		Hussey and Green's Contract	357	Ponder, Re	455
		Hylton v Heal	311		
		Ibis VI, The	514		

Provincial Cinematograph Theatres v Newcastle 661	Russian Commercial Bank v British Bank 733	Vickery v Vickery 343
R v Allen 358	Salter and Awdry's Lease, Re .. 605	Wake & De Freville v Motor Trade Assn 239
R v Beecham 768	Schiff, Re 174	Wakeford v Bishop of Lincoln .. 532
R v County Court Judge of Cheshire 552	Scottish Union Ins Co v New Zealand, &c 24	Waller, Re 534
R v Egan 782	Sheppard v Glossop Corp 472	Wallis v Griffiths 696
R v Molloy 534	Simmonds v Newport Coal Co .. 114	Walter v Walter 607
R v Pepper 715	Smith v G W Rly 172	Wankie Colliery v Inland Revenue .. 627
R v Southwark Borough 292	Smith & Son v Moore 492	Wansborough Paper Co v Laughland 94
R v Wheat 554	Smythe v Wiles 258	Ward v Law Society 791
Radcliffe v Inland Revenue Commrs 453	Spencer v Hemmerde 662	Webb & Co, Re 781
Rawlings v General Trading 220	Staveley, Re 154	Weller v Denton 473
Rawson, Re 204	Steel Wing Co, Re 240	Welsh Hospital Fund, Re 417
Reid v British & Irish Steam Packet Co. 326	Stoeck v Public Trustee 605	West, Re 379
Remington v Larchin 662	Sun Building Soc v Western Suburban Building Soc 734	Westminster's (Duke) S.E., Re .. 61
Reynolds v Atherton 454	Sutherland (Duchess), Re 513	Weston-super-Mare D C v Butt & Co 680
Richards, Re 342	Sutton, Re 155	Westwood v Haywood 753
Richards, Re, No. 2 357	Sutton's Contract, Re 259	Whitworth, Re 473
Richards v Davies 44	Tate v Thomas 327	Wicksted, Re 513
Rix, Re 513	Taylor v Faires 116	Wigzell, Re 493
Roberts v King & Co. 188	Thomas v Mackay 695	Wilcocks, Re 793
Roberts v Poplar Assessment Com- mittee 663, 780	Thomasson v Thomasson 736	Williams v Williams 156
Robinson v Marsh 514	Thompson v Bates & Son 95	Willis, Re 43
Rossdale v Denny 59	Underwood v Burgh Castle Syndicate 680	Willmott v Willmott 358
		Winfrey and Chatterton, Re 379
		Wood v Wallace 135
		Wrightson v McArthur & Hutchinsons 553

Names of Cases Discussed.

Aksionairnoye Obschestvo A M Luther v J Sagor & Co 561	British Isles Marine & General Ins Co Ltd v British Citizens Ass Co Ltd 564	Dreyfus & Co v Atlantic Shipping & Trading Co 371
Allen, Ex parte 352, 777	British Red Ash Collieries Ltd .. 218	Dunlop v Dunlop Rubber Co Ltd .. 182
Amodu Tijani v Secretary of S Provinces of Nigeria 729	British Stamp and Ticket Automatic Delivery Co v Haynes 657, 673	Eades, In re 531
Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co v R 471	Bristol City, The 797	East Ham Corp v Board of Trade .. 467
Aramayo Franche Mines Ltd, Re .. 579	Brooks v The King 748	Egan and Higgins 760
Attorney-General and others v Cory Brothers & Co 639	Brown v Craig and others 574	Ellis's Settlement, Re 694
Attorney-General v Wilts United Dairies Ltd 747, 763	Bugba v King Emperor 73	Ellis v Torrington 23
Baker v James Brothers & Sons Ltd 732	Burchell v Thompson 132	Elton Cop Dyeing Co v R Broadbent & Sons (Ltd) 5, 431
Baker v Lloyds Bank Ltd 256	Butterknowle Colliery Co v Bishop Auckland Industrial Co. 712	England v Inglis 238
Barker v Phillips 24	Calf & Sun Ins Offices Arbitration .. 171	Erith Engineering Co v Sandford Riley Stoker Co 186
Barnet v Cohen and others 624	Cardiff Corp v Isaac 642	Eva, The 797
Barton and Mitchell v Fincham 304, 307, 791	Cardwell v Cardwell 805	Everett v Griffiths 238
Barwick v South Eastern & Chatham Rly 151	Central India Mining Co v Société Coloniale Anversoise 91	Farrows Bank (Ltd), Re 673
Beard v Director of Public Prosecutions 576	Cheller v Royal Com on Sugar Supply 748	Ferdinand, Re, ex-Czar of Bulgaria .. 694
Beeton v Beeton and Robertson .. 748	Clark v Clark 761	Ferguson v Ferguson 431
Benabu and Co v The Produce Brokers' Co Ltd 487	Clark v Cox, McEuen & Co 765	Fettes v Robertson 427
Bett v Gibbins 72	Cogstad & Co and H Newsum, Sons & Co (Ltd) 325	Fiske v Fiske 186
Blackwell v Blackwell 203	Collis v Flower & Offen 108	Fitch v Dewes 622
Blundell Leigh v Attenborough .. 625	Conyngham, Re 320	Flint v Ead 516, 796
Bohun v Clements 203	County Hotel and Wine Co Ltd v Lon- don & North Western Rly Co 324, 596	Ford v Radford 132
Boks & Co v J H Rayner & Co .. 427	Crocker v Crocker 235	Ford v The Receiver for the Metro- politan Police District 391
Bombay and Persia Steam Navigation Co v MacLay 431	Crosse, Re 791	Foster Brothers v Great Eastern Rly Co 764
Bond v Pettie 253	Crown of Leon v Admiralty Commrs 653	Franklin v Franklin 748
Bonnard v London General Omnibus Co 350	Cruise v Terrell 796	French Government v Owners of s.s. "Tourushima Maru" 595
Bourton v Beauchamp 129	Davies v Bristow 822	Gardner, Re, Huey v Cunningham .. 828
Braby v Ibis 744	Day v Waldron 38	Gates v Jacobs 218
Braithwaite v Amalgamated Society of Carpenters. Ashley v General Union of Operative Carpenters and Joiners 426, 636	Debtor, Ex parte 491	Gedling v Marsh 113
British and Foreign Ins Co v Wilson Shipping Line 641	Debtor, Re a 146	Gibaud v Great Eastern Rly Co .. 449
	Denning v Secretary of State for India in Council 170	Goodwin v Rhodes 269
	Dey v Mayo 146	Gould and Co v Houghton 799
	Dey v Pullinger Engineering Co .. 289	Gould v. South Eastern & Chatham Rly Co 6
	Dock, Wharf, Riverside & General Labourers Union v White 708	Great Western Rly Co v Carpalla China Clay Co 370
	Dolphin v Robins 626	Grocock v Grocock 113

Hales Patents	38	Nesom v Metcalfe	658	Robinson & Co Ltd v The King	597, 601
Hampton v Winward	575	Neville v London Express Newspaper	72	Russian Commercial and Industrial	
Harcourt, Re: Viscount Portman v		Nicholson v Jackson	688	Bank v British Bank for Foreign	
Portman	804	Nierhaus, Re	579	Trade Ltd.	745
Hartell v Blanchley (Blackler) 218, 730, 822		Niger Company v Guardian Ass Co ..	448	S S Tibermede v Graham & Co ..	601
Hawke v Smith	23	O'Connor & Whitlans Arbitration, Re	452	Sandes Trust, Re	41
Hayes v Brown	452	O'Keefe v Great Western Rly Co ..	511	Sandy v Strath S S Co	765
Hemmings v Stoke Poges Golf Club		Parker, C W v Messrs C C & T Moore	621	Selvage v C Murrell & Sons Ltd ..	107
(Ltd)	73	Payne v The King	252	Sidebotham v Kershaw, Leese & Co	340
H M Works and Public Business Com-		Pearson, Re	791	Smidth, F S & Co v Greenwood ..	746
ms v Pontypridd Masonic Hall Co	238	Poiret v Poiret and Nash	216	St Marylebone Borough Council, Ex	
Hockley and Papworth v Goldstein 471, 808		Pole-Carew v Western Counties &		parte	151
Howard Houlder & Partners Ltd v		General Manure Co Ltd.	149, 452	Scaliaris v Ofverberg & Co	808
Union Marine Ins Co Ltd	507	Ponder, Re	710	Scott v Triggs	837
Hummerston v Leary and another ..	732	Premier Dairies Ltd v Garlick ..	113	Shaw, Re: Ex parte Official Receiver	808
Husseys & Green's Contract, Re ..	320	Ralli Brothers v Compania Naviera		Smythe v Wiles	657
Hylton v Heel	236	Sota y Aznar	549	South Dublin R D C: Ex parte, Gilson	
Ideal Film Renting Co v Nielsen ..	676	Rawlings v General Trading Co ..	254	v Bennett	91
James W Elwell, The	728	Rawlings v General Trading Co ..	689	Société Maritime Française v	
Johnson v Ball	828	Rhodes v Fielder, Jones & Harrison	59	Shanghai Dock & Engineering Co	676
Johnson v Maconochi	594	Redmond v Dainton	272	Starkie v Beardsley	427
Johnstone v Pedlar	711	Reeves v Davies	336, 790	Steel Wing Co Ltd, Re	253, 579, 808
Keyes v Keyes	425, 446	Remington v Larchin	636	Springer v Great Western Rly Co ..	530
Kimpson v Markham	269, 836	Remon v City of London Real Pro-		Sun Permanent Benefit Building	
Kin Tye Loong, The, v Seth	491	perties Co.	821	Society v Western Suburban &	
Kirsch & Co v Allen, Harding & Co ..	58	Richard de Larringa, s.s. v Admiralty		Harrow Road Permanent	
Kutner, Re: Ex parte The Debtor v		Comms	40	Building Society	132
The Official Receiver	621	Richard v Pownceby	637	Sutherland & Co v Hannevig Bros ..	799
Lavey, Re: Ex parte Cohen and Cohen	491	Richardson, Re	392	Sutherland, Re (Duchess): Bechoff &	
Leamon v R	108, 169	Richardson, Re, Pole v Pattenden ..	340	Co v Bubna	799
Lever Bros Ltd v Caton	595	R v Arthur Phillips		Sutton's Contract, Re	286
Levi v Levi	254	R v Bartlett	146	Taxation Comms v England, Scot-	
Levinstein v Levenstein	805	R v Beard	57	land & Australian Bank Ltd ..	257
Levy, Re: Ex parte The Trustee ..	23	R v Charles Tellett	371	Taylor v Faires	54
Lees v Duley	836	R v Daily Graphic: Ex parte Holden	390	Tetlow v Orela Ltd	171
Lloyds Bank v Pearson	41	R v Editor of the Daily Mail: Ex		Thomas v Jones	288
London General Ins Co v General		parte Farnsworth	268	Thomson's Mortgage Trusts, Re:	
Marine Underwriters Assn	289	R v Elnick	57	Thomson v Bruty	340
London & North Western Rly Co v		R v Evans & Pritchard	167	Thomas & Co v Mackay	712
Richard Hudson & Sons (Ltd) 6, 510		R v Frederick White Holdich ..	200	Thornet and Fehrand Yuills Ltd, In re	765
London & North Western Rly Co v		R v George Roberts alias Spalding ..	55	Tomalin v S Pearson & Son Ltd ..	109
Ashton (J P) & Co	6, 510	R v Governor of Brixton Prison: Ex		Tompkins v Rogers	253
Longman v Marcase	575	parte Waite	335	Town Properties Development Co Ltd	
Lyne, Stephens and Scott-Miller's		R v Greenwood	70, 89	v Winter	760, 822
Contract, Re	469	R v Hendrick	350	Trappes v Meredith	110
MacNaghten v Cox & Co	563	R v Justices of Dublin County: Ex		Trinidad Shipping & Trading Co v	
Mahmoud v Ispahani	808	parte T Cahill	112	Allston	550
Marie Leonhardt, The	732	R v Lloyd George: Ex parte Malone	168	Troy v Eastern Co of Warehouses	760
Markwald v Att-Gen	91, 746	R v Maria Stocks	321	Valeria, The	712
Marriott v Maltby Main Colliery Co	710	R v Marshland Smeeth & Fen District		Van Den Hurk v R Martens & Co ..	58
Martens v Home Freeholds Co ..	732	Comms	203	Vigilant, The	601
Marshall, A E v Mary Grinbawm ..	728	R v Paulson	324, 626	Walter v Walter	641
Maskell v Hill	653	R v Thomas Allsopp Wheat	321	Walter Winans, Re	285, 690
Mason, Herring & Brooks v Harris ..	269	R v Adelina Howard	527	Weatherley, Re	24
McDonald, Re: Ex parte McCullum	5	R v Bottomley	487	Webb & Co, In re H J	747, 778
McDonnell v McDonnell	676	R v Capt Biggar and others	392	Wedgewood, Re, Allen v Public Trustee	655
McHugh v McDonrich	579	R v Cook and Clarkson	447	Weld-Blundell v Stephens	71
Melachrino v Nicholl & Knight	58	R v County Court Judge of Cheshire		West v West	694
Millbourn v Lyons	271	and United Society of Boiler-		Whaley, Re: Re Scott: Ex parte	
Mills v Cannon Brewery Co	676	makers: Ex parte Malone	565	Official Receiver	507
Ministry of Food v Anon	413	R v Cox & Railton	689	White v Riley	708
Mitchell v Townend & Co	253	R v Field & Gray	183, 287	Wilson v United Counties Bank Ltd	5, 257
Moore & Co v Landauer & Co	289	R v Graham Campbell: Ex parte		Wilson, Holgate & Co v Belgian Grain	
Moore v Flanagan	151	Ahmed Hamid Mousere	467	& Produce Co	59
Mortimer v Beckett	272, 550	R v Inspector of Cannon Row Police		Wilson Shipping Co v British &	
Morpeth Corp v Northumberland		Station: Ex parte Brady	672	Foreign Ins Co	73
Farmers Auction Mart Co	658	R v Pepper: R v Platt	761	Wilmott v Wilmott	351
Munro, Brice & Co v Martin	40	R v Poplar Borough Council: Ex		Withers v Withers and Collingwood	637, 709
Murphy, Joseph	336	parte the London County Council		Winfrey and Chatterton's Agreement,	
Mycroft v Sleight	527	& Metropolitan Asylums Board 653, 820		Re	828
National Bank fur Deutschland, Re	579	R v Quarmby	411, 414	Woodward v Lee	594
Needham v Needham & Bennett ..	689	Roberts v Poplar Assessment Com	526, 744	Young v Ladies Imperial Club Ltd	531, 814

er.]

7,601

745
601
41
765
107
340
746

151
808
837
808
657

91

676
427
9,808
530

132
799

799
286

257
54
171
288

340
712
765
109
253

0,822
110

550
760
712
58
601
641

5,690

24
7,778
ee 655
71
694

507
708
5,257

59

73
351
37,709

828
594
1,814